8844

[illegible]

894415
30074

15

134

மதுரை மாவட்ட அரசிதழ்

8944B — 30074

[Page 225 to 437
End]

Pl see the vol 8944A
also 30074, page 1 to 223

Proposed indorsement on the Petition of Vardupah Naik to the Board of Revenue Dated 13th of December 1845

The Petitioners Statement of Land belonging to him having been given to others is perfectly untrue, he having to avoid the tax, formally resigned the same in petitions dated 6th of July & 19th of November 1842 and 5th July 1843 - besides giving a deposition on the 27th of January of the same year Petitioner has therefore no right to any of the 120 Goontahs formally resigned by him

(Signed) W. Elliot
Sub Collector

11 April 1846 J.B.

(True Copy)

J. Blackburne
Prin'l Coll'r

No. 157

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindegul 11th April 1846
Recd 13th Do

Sir

I have the honor to forward an address from the Tahsildar of Iyempilly on the subject of Atlancollam Sluice situated within the limits of the Village Keeranoor. It appears that on account of the depth of water in January last the Civil Engineer mentioned in his Diary of the same month that on the subsiding of the water, the sluice should be examined & repair Estimated for. On the 26th of February I sent an order to the Tahsildar to that effect and accordingly the Tahsildar proceeded to the Spot, & Estimated for the detail of the work according to the amount mentioned in the Engineer's Diary but the Engineer Estimated for Brick and Chunam whilst the Tahsildar recommend in his Arzy of the 24th Ultimo that certain of the work should be of stone, as the amount allowed, or estimated was not to be exceeded, the Sherista dar, to whom the Arzy was referred considers there is no objection to the proposed ... alterations

... where required but on this point I request you will first obtain the acquiescence of the Civil Engineer for the change of material.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most Obedient servant

W. Elliot

Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Collector's Cutcherry
7th April 1846

Recd 13th J.B.

For the Principal Collector of Madura

From the Sub Collector
11th April 1846

No. 172

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of

Madura

Dindigul 17th April 1846

Sir

Recd 21st Do

1 I have the honor to acknowledge the recei[pt] of your letter of the 2d Instant with petition dated 27th March from Muttomangeiah Muttya Naik Zemindar of Cadoor on the subject of certain of his land having been made over to the Zemindary of Sukkampatty &ca now under the management of the Circar. The said petition does not commence very happily, for it states that he himself mentioned the appropriation of his land to Mr. Hurdis which he must know to be particularly false as he could not have been born in Mr. Hurdis time & has only held the Zemindary about 7 years.

2 In the said Petition it is further mentioned that he presented me with a petition on the 7th of March & very probably it was his intention, but the person into whose hand he gave it, probably a Cuchry servant who might ~~have~~ drawn it up, had changed the 7 into 13 & forwarded it accordingly, but forgot to make a similar correction in the Copy thereof sent to you

at a still subsequent date.

3 With respect to the case itself the Cadoor Zemindar some years back laid claim to a piece of land consisting of about 2500 Guntahs which the then Sub Collector decided against him. The Zemindar appealed as was very natural, but the Principal Collector confirmed the Sub Collectors decree. The same spirit which induced him to lay the claim in the first instance & persist in it would not allow him to relinquish so valuable a spot & an appeal was made to the Board of Revenue who confirmed the lower awards: The Zemindar has on more than one occasion urged to me, the injustice of the said decisions but I have no hesitation, especially after having seen the place, of declaring my opinion as to the perfect correcting of the nonsuit. The Zemindar has doubtless been carried to great lengths by his wealth & may feel his losses in the attempt far more than the non receipt itself of what certainly never belonged either to him or his Zemindary, but he was not disposed to give up the treat altogether so he pretended In December 1842 that there was a new spot close to it which had been usurped

by

by the Ryots of the Sukkampetty Zemindary Consisting of 13½ Guntahs in the 12th Contbey The Spot being called Poddea Goundon Modake & situated to the North of the Chinna Karai (or small mound) 27

4 On the 17th December or date after the receipt of the Petition an order was sent to the Mozumdar who reported the 21st of March '43 that the land had been from Fasly 1246 to the present time in the occupation of the Sukkampetty people & was not included in the land belonging to the Cadoor Zemindar, that the Nattamgar & Curnum had given Depositions shewing the land to belong to the Zemindary of Shukkampetty & to be included in the dispute formerly settled and therefore no new case at all.

5 The above record being sent to the Sheristatdar, he appears to have considered the same insufficient to pass any decision upon & recommended that the Tahsildar Vencatramanah should examine the case with more particulars. Accordingly an order was prepared & despatched to that effect on the 24th of April 1843. The Vakeel for the Cadoor Zemindar stated he had no other

ther accounts than those formerly sent in the Vinapaea case. The Curnum & Natamgar of Yaddaalputty stated that since the fysal time the said lands had not been included in the Caddoor Zemindary. But the fysul accounts were destroyed by fire. The Shukkamputty Curnum stated that from the Fysal time to 1245 the said land was waste from which time it had been cultivated & included in the said Village Shukkamputty, & that there was no dispute about the land prior to Fuly 1252, that he had accounts for Fusly 1236, but not for the fysul time; that the present land was not included in the former case, but it was included in No. 32 of the Shukkamputty Village. The Vakeel for the Shukkamputty Zemindar in a petition to the Tahsildar dated 24 of May 1843 stating that if the record in the Huzzur were sent for it would be found that this case had formerly been dismissed by the late Sub Collector, he gave another Petition on the following day repeating that the case had long since been settled & he wished for a weeks delay to see if he had any other accounts & Documents

2/ 23

6 The case appears to have been laid over for 6 months. On the 17th of November '43 the Zemindar of Shukkampatty sent a Vakeel to the Tahsildar. On the 30th of the same month Iyempallien Koleappah Naiker a relation of the Zemindar & 50 years old stated the land to belong to Cadoor, but did not know how many years the ground had been waste, only it had been cultivated 2 years by the Zemindar's people.

The father of the Zemindar's Vakeel Sama pillay who appears to have formerly stated the land to belong to Shukkampatty found it answer his purpose on the above date to depose that the land belonged to Cadoor.

The Sumprty of the said Zemindar Arulapilly stated the land was included in Yeddicapatty & that originally Amblakaran & others had cultivated it, and that it had always been in their possession, the Shukkampatty Ryots now cultivated the spot and it had been for 30 years previous waste land. The Yeddicahpatty Natangar Manicatty Gownden stated to the same effect & that the land since the fysal time had only been cultivated 2 years. Yeddicahpatty Veera gownden & Tallicpatty Andiamblakaran stated to

somewhat

somewhat similar effect. Teyeddiah putty -
tty said there was cultivation but did not
know how much -

The abstract of all which was that the land
had only been cultivated 2 years since the
fysul time and then by persons of the Cadoor
Zemindary when there was a dispute with
the Villagers of Shukkampully and the land
was not included in the former case.

7. On the 2nd of January 1844 the
Shukkrampully Natamgar was examined
& stated that he himself probably collected
the tax prior to 1248 but he was then young.
Since 1246 he had collected the tax from
Jungol umblakaren & others up to the present
time. He does not remember where he was
present when the Tahsildar visited the place
but the present spot is different from that in the
former case.
Tunnimmuchen deposed that for 5 years the
land had been cultivated by the people of
Shukkampully & tax duly collected by the
Natamgar.
Yellamalla Gounden deposed to cultivating
for 3 or 4 years
Shempatyen deposed to 6 years cultivation

& the tax being paid to the Shukkamputty Cha-
tangar

Sheddia Gownden deposed to his cultivation
for 3 years & payment of tax & the land was
included in the Fysul time in Shukkamputty

Chinna Ramaran stated his father cultivat
10 years before & he had cultivated for 2 years
& both paid tax to Shukkamputty in which
Village the land was included in the fysul time

Andy stated he had cultivated 1 Guntah
for 2 years

Shengaran umblakaran cultivated for 3 years
and paid the tax to the Shukkamputty Chas-
tangar

Soobbiah Naicken deposed to paying the tax
to the Shukkamputty Officers -

A mahratta account was drawn up in the
Talook which shewed the land to belong to the
Shukkamputty Zemindary & that the disputed
number was 32. But the Tahseldar in his
report dated 7th January 1844 stated that
he considered from the evidence that it belonged
to Caddoor

8 The bundle was sent to the Dufter
on the 15th January as the former one had been
and the Curnums of the adjoining Villages
were

were sent for some of them arrived on the 24th of May 1844, but requested leave to return for some feast after which they would all attend. in this however they failed & in September following those whose attendance could not be procured before were sent to me, in conformity with my renewed orders & lastly that on the 29th August 1844.

9. The Witnesses in behalf of the Cadoor Zemindar do not prove anything in favor of the lands in dispute being attached to Goddaupully, the Natamgar of that Village namely Jewaden does indeed state that 30 years ago some persons of his Village cultivated that jungle spot, but he knows not how much land and such would no more prove right ~~[illegible]~~ than usurpation. Another Ryot deposed to a similar effect but the Witnesses for the Shukkampully Zemindar or on behalf of the Circar including Natamgars Curnums & Ryots, 6 persons, deposed some of them to being present when the boundaries were fixed by flags, & others to cultivating the ground themselves on several occasions & paying the money to Shukkampully

10th. The supposition that these lands which only consist of 13½ Guntahs of very

237

inferior land not being included in the former
dispute arises doubtless from the same not being
specified in the Original Complaint before the
late Sub Collector, but that it is included in
the same ground may be learnt from the plan
given in by the Vakeel of the Cadoor Zemindar
Harooparah pelly with his Argy No. 2173 of
1844 dated 21st of Decr. & the Vinipurah which
I visited gives its name to the whole parcel.

11. It is not customary for any one to build
a wall through the middle of his own lands,
the wall, if it exists, will be at the boundary
or extreme limit of the Estate & such is the posi-
tion of that built long since by the Zemindar
of Cadoor. The strongest proof of his never
having been entitled to the land he lays claim
to, is to be found in the erection position & direction
of the said wall. But there appears to me
to be abundant evidence independent of that line
of demarcation to shew that the lands pertain
to the Zemindary of Shukkan pully & that the
case was fully and permanently settled
in 1839. The Zemindar of Cadoor wished
me to visit the spot and although such was
perfectly useless, I appointed a time about October
last & sent my tents to the Village nearest to the
spot

spot requested to be seen directing all parties to be present, that I might not have any further trouble in the matter, the heavy rains & nonattendance detained me from personally inspecting the place & after the Monsoon I was busily engaged in the Muttah of Calamanthy & Seized the opportunity of proceeding to the spot on the 7th of March; On the following day the Zemindar of Cadoor visited me & declaimed against the former decision, but I assured him it was perfectly correct & that from the plan of his Vakeel there never could exist any doubt of the land belonging to Shakkam-putty & included in the former dispute & that the puttahs of the Ryots for so many years shewed how long they had been in possession; This opinion was the cause of his petition (first dated 9th March) to me & that dated 27th to you. The Shenishtadar, Tahsildar, Head Gomastah, Cadoor Agent & others accompanied me to the lands. altered 18th at Bora... 18th

1/2 When at Shakkamputty I received some of the Ryots Puttahs & took a few depositions in support of them.

One was the late Natungar Periah Mallama Naiken aged 80 years & grandfather of the present Zemindar, he stated that since he could recollect the said lands had been cultivated

251

by the people of Shukkamputty & the tax collect-ed accordingly.

Pammy Naiken, 60 years old, stated that the same lands had always been attached to Shukkamputty, but never to Cadoor

Soobbah Naiken, 50 years old, stated to the same effect.

Polaiporate Monegaren 60 years, Nalla-labomminaiken 40 years, Narangona Gownden 50 years, and Nallatamby umblakaren 50 years old, also deposed to a similar effect

13 There are still some codjons to appear given by the Cadoor Zemindars people, which are not yet found, but from the evidence already given I have not the slightest hesitation in stating my opinion that the Cadoor Zemindar has no right to the 13½ Guntahs he now lays Claim to, & that it was virtually included in the Decision passed in 1839 which I believe at present in your Office.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant

W. Elliot
Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Coll^r Cutchery
7th April 1846

Dispatched 20th
Recd 21st JD

For the Principal Collector of
Madura

From the [illegible]
17th April 1846

No. 178

241 95

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura
Dindigul 21st April 1840
Recd 27 [illegible]

Sir

I have the honor to lay before you the further enquiry which has taken place in the matter of the Guddam and Kalvarapatty lands as requested in your letter of the 27 of January last.

2. On the 6th of February an order was sent by me to the Tahsildar to remeasure the whole lands previously examined by the Acting Zillahdar Kistniah, and to be accompanied by the suspended Curnum and Natamgar, and the officers acting for them together with the Ryots. The Tahsildar proceeded to the spot accordingly and appeared before me on the 5th of March, when at Sheek Kampatty, and reported that the villagers had evidently cultivated the lands now denied by them, as there were marks of the same and that they made useless objections to their entry. Yea but in his Report of the same day stated that if he measured the lands as pointed out by the Ryots the Acting village officers would not agree to sign the accounts and that if he measured according to those officers' shewing, the ryots

Ryots would not agree - that the lands of Chokkalingum and 8 others according to their cultivation during 1254 (15 parcels) there appeared Guntah 58 $\frac{13\frac{1}{2}}{16}$ assessed at 87" 2" 1; Shewing an increase of Rupees 7" 3 or 3 $\frac{15\frac{1}{2}}{16}$ Goontahs - and a decrease of Rupees 16" 5" 3 or 9 $\frac{13\frac{3}{4}}{16}$ to which the Ryots agreed, but as there was a difference between the Ryots statements and those of the Acting Curnum and Natamgar, if it was desired to take the measurements without the signatures of the Ryots or suspended Curnum and Natamgar he would do so -

3. - On the same day Vangle Gowndan an inhabitant, gave a Petition that the present measuring by the Gomastah Dasupant, Roysom Kreshniah, and others, was proceeding improperly and requested I would personally inspect the lands - I therefore sent an order to the Tahseldar stating that as his argy differed from his verbal statement he was to stop the measuring till I came there, for which purpose I dispatched a tent and purposed proceeding forthwith in company with the Sheristadar when I found myself obliged to have recourse to rather violent measures to cancel the affects

of

of a long exposure under canvass and so
totally unfit for the species of personal
labor, to which I am partial, and which
in the present case appeared requisite
I therefore on the 26th of March directed
the Sheristadar with a Hoozoor Gomas-
tah, the Tahsildar and his party to do
the needful -

4. In an address dated the
27th the Sheristadar wished to have
the former accounts of Guddam &ca -
To which a reply was despatched on the
30th that the accounts were with the
Principal Collector, but as the village
officers would probably have Copies
they must suffice - The Sheristadar
proceeded the Village of Guddam on
the 31st (as his presence was required
during the examination of the Renter
of Nellacottah and others on the 30th)
and reported on the 5th Instant that
having gone with all the parties con-
cerned and examined certain lands
pointed out to him, - He found certain
in lands increase and some decrease in
the cultivators stated they had only
taken up the same lands in 1254 as
that they had done in 1253 but in
some lands where the Ryots stated
they had taken up fresh lands this
year

year (1255) the roots and stubble of the
last years produce were visible but
the Ryots stated that they must have
come there when they ploughed their
other lands. – That the Ryots were then
having their third crop. – That some lands
the Ryots stated they only ploughed – and
the adjoining Ryots stated their ignorance
of what land was sown and what not used;
but that no one acknowledged the addi-
tional portion now enclosed, as having
been used last year, except the acting
Curnum, Natamgar, Jellahdar and
Vangly Fownden. – The acting Curnum
stated the differences arose from his
having measured the actual cultiva-
tion, and from that land which the
Ryots now say they had cultivated
with cholum having been at that time actually
cultivated with Tobacco. – The Sheris-
tadar stated that nothing could
now be learnt respecting the culti-
vation of Fusly 1254 and the Gomastah
who accompanied him stated that
even the land marks for 1254, or the
limits of cultivation, were not now
discernable. –

5. The Tahsildar was desired
to report his opinion also, not that
it

it was expected he would on any account differ from the Sheristadar but it was as well to have at least 2 on one side as there appeared 4 on the other - It was not likely either that any of the Ryots would peach, as it could only be attended with loss to themselves - The Tahseldar in his arzees dated 8th and 14th Instant acquiesced in the Sheristadars observations.

6. This appears to have been from the begining a most unpopular investigation -

Before the Curnum could be made to give up the accounts to the acting Tilloldar elapsed 3½ Months, and even then continued every species of hindrance - The examination took less than 2 hours whilst 4 were occupied in translating and transcribing the accounts into Marattah and Tamil - One Month passed from my absence in another direction, for another Month the parties were daily expected when not appearing I proceeded

d to the spot took the necessary evidence and
passed a decision forwarded on the 7th of
August. The case was then after 5 weeks
returned to me for reinvestigation. On
the 8th of November last a petition was presented
31st October purporting to be signed by
certain 7 Ryots, but this I think was
fully shewn, by the evidence of the witnesses
whose names were therein mentioned,
and which accompanied my letter of the
2 of December, to be perfectly false, and,
moreover a forgery got up for the occasion,
but no further notice appears to have
been taken of the same beyond its being
placed on record or added to the documents in the case
—. On the 9th of the same month
December 1845, I submitted the result
of the reexamination & referred to the
proved false petition in the 1st and 2nd
Paras, the remaining Paras were taken
up in maintaining my former opi-
-nion and adducing reasons for the
same — I still maintain those opinions
and nothing could strengthen them more
than the Sheristadar and Tahsildar
having avowedly adopted only the Ryots
Statement! as if any Ryot would be silly
enough to give evidence against his own
fraud

fraud or appropriation of the Circar lands-
and yet it is allowed that appearances are
against them in as much as stubble has
been discovered and forwarded to the Huzur
where it has been stated no cultivation
had taken place - The last record was
another 6 Weeks in the Principal Cutchery
and on requesting a perfect reinvestigation
the former record was retained in the said
office - I cannot but feel that the exami-
nation from the commencement has been
unpopular and chiefly amongst the Circar
Servants, who seem to have thrown every
obstacle rather than assistance in the
way of investigation or ascertainment
of the truth - Nothing could be easier than
for a Man to cultivate in Succession Ragi
Tabacco, and cholum - or Ragi, Tabbacco, and
Cotton and yet deny in toto the cultivation
of Tabacco, although it was when that cul-
tivation was visible that the curnums
entered it - This was quite as easy as to
deny a produce the remnant of which was
actually found in the ground - Yet even
in the latter case Support was not want-
ing to find an excuse; viz, that the plough
might have brought it there from the
adjoining field - This will account for
the increase and decrease adverted to in your

letter

letter under reply Para 5. If it be really
the case as stated by the Sheristadar
that the former years cultivation can-
not now be detected it appears advisable
if not requisite to stop useless an
investigation. The Ryots are stated
to have cultivated such and such lands
in Fusly 1253. The Ryots say they did
not cultivate in 1253, but acknowledge
they did so in 1254. If the Ryots state-
ments are to be considered as equiva-
lent to truth and final, it is equally so in every case
and similar investigations useless. It is
apparently supposed in the 10 Para of
your letter under reply that the
average increase or decrease of 10
per cent on the measurement has
not been allowed to the Ryots of Gud-
dam and Pulivarapatty but I beg to
state that it has been duly allowed
as stated also by the Tahsildar in
his observations & The Custom of
granting half tax for Garden duly
cultivated with Periyah has not
been lost sight of in the present
case.

8. It will be seen by the state-
ments contained in the 1st Packet submitted

to you that Bribes had been offered for the
further concealment of the lands discovered
to have been cultivated - And it may be
remembered that the Zillahdar was former-
=ly fined for a similar case in the Talook
of Nellacottah - The Zillahdar of
Maramoot has been directed to make a
perfect reinvestigation of the lands
of the said village whilst drawing
up the Karar tagobady accounts for the
present year but from all that has
been said above should you consider
it impracticable within a sufficiently
limitted period to arrive at the exact
amount leviable upon the said two vil-
=lages of Geddem and Kalwarapatty for
concealment of cultivation during
1843, and, that whilst that matter
is being brought to a close, it would
be advisable to replace the parties
in Circar employ, I would beg to re=
commend that the Zillahdar be ap=
pointed to the Cusbah Iyempilly
of Coombum in Tengarai in lieu of the
officer at present in those [illegible],
and

and that the present Acting Zillah-
dar who with every obstacle to con-
-tend with, has conducted the duties
of that office for more than 1½ Years,
receive half the Salary of that office
and his Services dispensed with -
In like manner that the Curnum
and Natamgar should return to
their several offices half their pay
being given to those who had done
their duty for them - and the increase
for Fusly 1253 can be carried, after
realization to the account of Sevai
Jumma -

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most obedt. Servt.
[signature]
Sub Collector

Sub Collector's
Cutchery
Dindigul
21st April 1846

Despatched from
Palany
25th April -
Recd 27th [initials]

No. 132

From the Sub Collector
To The Principal Collector of Madura

Palany 25th April 1840
Recd 29th ''

Sir

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th Instant and to forward the former record in the matter of the Devadhanapettah Oolcombey lands.

2. Whatever may be the personal merits or individual character of the litigating parties the same should not certainly be allowed in any way to influence a decision in the present case or of a similar description.

3. The abstract of the Case is simply this Vardapah Naik to whom the lands were given on cowl failed to act up to his agreement declaring his inability to pay for any portion and the impossibility of cultivating more than half the said land from its position and rather than pay for any portion more than once re-signed the whole. He appears however to have got half back on the plea that the remainder was not fit for Cultivation. Vardapah Naik never resided in any of the Villages appertaining to Devadhanapettah whilst Veloyda Poolaven does and seeing the land abandoned he took it up on full tax and I believe the whole of the portion stated (to suit the occasion) to be unfit has

this

this year been fully Cultivated -

4: Respecting the division of the water I beg to refer you to your own instructions of the 25th of September 1837 and 1st October 1840 granting the allowance of 5 days water for the whole 250 Goontahs, and to mine of the 27th May 1845 for the fixing a moiety thereof for Vardapah Naiks 120 Goontahs and the remainder for the 130 held by Veloyda Poolaven I considered the case so exceedingly plain as to make it a waste of time to be more explicit, the grounds of the present complaint so narrow, as not to admit of a doubt - I acknowledge there has been for 10 years much party spirit and highly improper proceedings respecting the said lands, but whilst Veloyda Poolaven has had nothing whatever to do with the said intrigues Vardapah Naik has been a principal actor throughout, as shewn in the Paragraphs 2 to 20 of my address No. 406 to the Board of Revenue dated 3d September last and duly forwarded through your office as well as in the records to which the said communication refers -

5: In submitting the endorsement alluded to in your letter under reply I drew up as concise and effective an order as I considered least likely to admit of misapprehension and most likely to settle a case the

further

further agitation of which would probably, as before, cause those fertile lands again to be fallow and be the certain injury if not the eventual ruin of both parties. For Vardapa Naik can shew no possible right to more and Veloyda Poolavan will scarcely be content with less. Should the Subject of the supply of water be the only remaining entry required in the Endorsement adverted to there can be no possible objection to its admission.

I have the honor to be &c.

(Signed) W. Elliot
Sub Collector

Palany
Sub Collr's Cuchry
25th April 1840.
Recd 29th ~~13~~

(True Copy)

J. Blackburne
Prind. Collr.

Copy of a letter
From the Sub Collr
25th April 1846

Statement of Emergent Maramut works up to 30th April as received from the Talooks.

Names of the Talooks	No of the Road	Names of the Village	Particulars of the Works	Estimate	Advance R	A	P	Work done R	A	P	Balance R	A	P	Remarks
Toddekonmoo	No 15	Allamarattyo putty	Raising Road	[illegible]	25	-	-	-	-	-	70	5	-	Work progressing
			Collecting Small or Bro: Ken Stones for Do	[illegible]	130	-	-	87	3	-	194	1	-	
			Ramming the Same	[illegible]	5	-	-	-	-	-	15	10	-	
			Total	[illegible]	160	-	-	87	3	-	280	-	-	
	No 1	Muttapuddy	Erecting a new tunnel in place of the old one	[illegible]	10	-	-	-	-	-	45	10	-	Materials prepared.
			Grand Total	[illegible]	170	-	-	87	3	-	325	10	-	
Nellacottah	No 2	Annaputty	Repairing the Codavanaur Bridge flooring	5	4	-	-	-	-	-	4	11	5	Materials prepared.
			Repairing the approach &c. to the Same	[illegible]	110	-	-	-	-	-	123	11	-	Work progressing.
	No 17	Shemputty	Cutting Channel on the west side of the Codavanaur Bridge	[illegible]	64	-	-	49	2	-	53	10	-	
	No 18	Buttagoondah	Maujelar Bridge Laying the flooring &c. to the Same	[illegible]	140	-	-	18	12	4	225	0	8	Work postponed - but some materials prepared and money expended - it is proposed to continue this entry till some satisfactory or final adjustment can be made respecting the sums advanced and expended.
			Total	[illegible]	318	-	-	61	14	4	407	7	1	
			Grand Total	[illegible]	488	-	-	149	1	4	733	1	1	

[illegible]

Sub Collector

No. 207

From the Sub Collector,
To the Principal Collector of Madura,

Chattrapatty 18th May 1840.

Recd 28th

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th Instant No. 339 stating you were sorry I did not rather ask, and trust to the report of my Sheristadar, regarding the disbursements of the maniem of the Palkanoot Chattram, than accept his statements as recorded by the Tahsildar of Nellacottah. Although it is not specified whose statements are alluded to, they are believed to refer to the Bramin house keeper - but that the Principal Collector may see that I did ask the Sheristadar attached to the Sub Division for a report and that he replied he was unable to afford it and therefore referred me to the Tahsildar of Nellacottah, I beg to enclose a copy of the Ferist which accompanied my letter to you of the 1st Ultimo, The documents therein referred to I believe are still before you. Reference to the Sheristadars non ability to furnish the desired information, and my intention, on that account, to procure it from the Nellacottah Tahsildar are mentioned at the end of the ... said commencement ...

and the more than approval, even request in your letter of the 3rd April that I will procure from the Talook any necessary information "to enable me to answer the whole of yours to me of the 20th of March last." I trust therefore the Principal Collector will perceive that on the part of my proceedings there was no cause for regret.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servt
[illegible]
Sub Collector

Chittoor
Sub Collector's Cutchery
18th May 1846.

Recd 22 [illegible]

From the Sub
Collector 18th May
1846

மதுரைசில்லா [illegible]

துரைஅவர்களுடைய [illegible]

[illegible] யுவ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

W. Elliot

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

No. 252.

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of

Madura.

Puttagoontah 20th May 1846
Recd 24th JB

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt

No. 151 of your letter under date the 16th Inst and in reply thereto state from information received from my Sheristadar that Fusly 1253 Picha Mootoo requested to have a piece of land situated under or near a tank for Nunjah Cultivation. One Vencatachella pillay wished to have the said land for punjah but Picha Mootoo desired the same for Nunjah and it was given to him as the land had been waste for 10 years. He appears not to have cultivated any of it, but states that he has this year subrented it. Picha Mootoo did not deliver any whole kist but only paid 2 annas the remainder of the Rs 3-4 was realised by the sales of a hut belonging to him -

The land was left waste in the following year but this year, Fusly 1255 Pichamootoo has stated, that he subrented it.

I have the honor to be

Buttigoortah | Your Most Obedient Servant

Sub Collector's Cutchery

27th May 1846

Recd 29th JB

[signature]

Sub Collector

For the Principal Collector of

Madura

From the Sub Collr 27th May 1846

Recd 17 June 1845

Report of the Sub Collector of Masulipatam on the Mutah of Calavagunty situated in the Talook of [illegible] Division

In consequence of the stated inability on the part of the Mutahdar Mutteywa[...] my Naik to pay the amount of Peshcash fixed on Calavagunty, one of the two Estates in his possession, and that he was incurring debt by its retention, he requested permission on the 11th of February 1839 to resign the same into the hands of the Circar for that and the coming Fusly 1248 & 1249, as he was totally
A.D 1838/9 - 1839/40
unable to meet the expenses; he therefore feared the consequences and desired to retain only the Mutah of Velon. In reply to which the Principal Collector, on the 16th of the same month, endeavored to point out to the Mutahdar that with the exception of Fusly 1247 he had, for each of the 23 years,
A.D. 1837/8
received an annual profit of Rupees 1000 there-fore he had not seen his accounts properly, which was now recommended to the Mutah-dar respecting which [illegible]

was answered, that if the Estate once came to the Circar, it would not be restored. he was therefore recommended to reconsider the matter, as the coming year would undoubtedly be favourable.

The Mutahdar, on the 1st of March replied that although there might be an annual increase of Rupees 1000, he himself did not collect or enjoy it as he rented the Estate to others. On the 11th idem a list of the Annual Beriz, from Fusly 1211 to 1247 / A.D. 1801/2 to 1834/0 37 years which had been formerly sent by the Mutahdar, was referred to but the annual collection & balance were not entered, which was now required to be done, and a plan forwarded for the purpose. On the 27 of March the Mutahdar submitted a list of the Demand, Collection & Balance, for 24 years from Fusly 1224 to 1248 / A.D. 1814/5 to 1838/9. By an Order of the Principal Collector, dated the 28th of June, the Mutahdar was required to state how he obtained the two Estates of Catamandy & Velore, whether he purchased them at the same or at different sales and to forward any order or documents he might have to shew the date and all particulars.

On the 5th of July the Mutahadar stated that his father [illegible] purchased the Estates at separate Sale in the year [illegible] Shaik/Fusly 1216 the [illegible] Mutah for A.D. 1806
1250 Pagodas, and Calamandy for 550; total 1800 Pagodas, for which Sum as the only [illegible] a portion at the time was his Mutah fell into arrears of Peishkash, the Mutah was assumed, but released [illegible] the balances being duly paid, his father received the Estate back in November of the following year. The original Sun-nud had been burnt in his fathers time.

3 On the 10th of July following, the Principal Collector addressed the Board of Revenue, and in consequence of their reply, the Mutahdar was directed on the 2nd of September to proceed to Madura within the 15 [illegible] with all his accounts. He attended accordingly & gave a Deposition on the 14th of that month. On the 16th the Principal Collector proposed to the Board that the Mutah of Calamandy should be assumed for [illegible] years in order to enable him to form a [illegible] estimate of its resources, for which permission was granted by Government on the 4th of November 1839 communicated by the Board of Revenue on the 21st [illegible] sent by the Principal Collector direct

Extract of Proceedings 6th February 1845

Tahsildar of Ipempilly on the 30th of the same month.

This Mutah of Calamandy may therefore be considered as having been under the immediate management of the Circar for 7 years, a period far exceeding that originally contemplated, but even if no positive collusion has been shewn to exist and if it has not been already acknowledged that the Mutahdar received an annual surplus from the Estate, it has at least been fully established that neither the maintenance of the Circar rates, the amount of Peshkash, the inferiority of the land, nor indisposition of the Ryots to cultivate, have had any operation in preventing the Mutahdar from continuing to realize a profit after payment of the Circar Peshkash.

5 On account of the period which has elapsed since the project was first entertained it may tend perhaps materially to facilitate the requisite examination of the papers &ca connected therewith, if an outline of the regular order of the proceedings be given. After the temporary assumption of the Estate as above stated the then Sub Collector directed on the 3d of December that the cultivation

2

Kea Tavaimp account up to the 5 [illegible]
months should be sent to that Cutchery &
in another order of the same date infor-
mation was required as to the method
adopted by the Mootahdar in giving
lands for cultivation. To this last the
Tahsildar replied on the 13th that the
fallow lands were included with the
cultivated, and settlement made for
909 11/16 Cawnies assessed at Rupees 7144
4-6, and that he sent the accounts ac-
cordingly, that the first Kist had been
collected by the Mutahdar himself to the
amount of Rs 799-2-2 and had been
forwarded by him to the Talook Trea-
sury, that the Natamgars & Curnums
had given in written Statements confirm-
ing those of the Mutahdar, but were
not aware how much land was cul-
tivated & how much fallow, that they
stated they would pay according to the
Mutahdar's puttahs, not according
to Hoolovs tax, that he would send
a Gomastah to measure the lands,
but he wished [illegible] according to
[illegible]

371

[illegible] The Tahsildar was ordered
on the 22nd idem that, if such appeared
to be the case, the collection should be
made according to the Mutahtars
rates, that a final answer would be
sent thereafter but in the mean
time certain two [illegible] and a Gomas
tah should be sent to examine the
actual cultivation according to the
Hoocoom [illegible] rates & the Poornadhay
em, with all the particulars & the
accounts duly forwarded.

On the 20th of December, the Principal
Collector in a Yaddasht wished to know
whether the collections were made according
to the fixed tax, or the Mutahdars rates. On
the 22d the Sub Collector replied that the Tah-
sildar having reported that the Ryots de-
sired to pay according to the Mutahdars
rates, it was considered proper to act ac-
cordingly but that in the following year the
Circar rates must be maintained, on
which point, however, the opinion of the
Principal Collector was requested, in con-
sequence of which on the 27th the Sub Col-
lector was informed that if the Dowl
[illegible] accounts were sent they would be

223

forwarded to the Board of Revenue [illegible] the Mutahdars Putta and their orders obtained. On the 1st of January 1840 an order was sent to the Talook quickly to prepare the said Dowl &ca accounts and the D^o. to send two Tulludars and two [illegible] tatis for the purpose mentioned on the 23^d of December previous. On the 13th of January the Principal Collector urged the completion of the accounts, and on the 21 the Tahsildar was desired to report the cause of delay, which was [illegible] on the [illegible] of March.

7 On the 10th of March the Tahsildar reported that he herewith sent the Dowl Kararsagulady accounts according to which it appears that the Mutahdar's settlement of cultivated & fallow lands included in the [illegible] holdings (according to the fixed tax after deducting the Hootoo [illegible] / amounted to Rupees 1767 [illegible]

The Mootahdar's Dowl remissions amounted to 1033½ 5

The remainder to be collected which was alone alluded to by the Tahsildar was 734 [illegible]

Further cultivation up to the above said 10 of March (Moolo tax or Circar rate) 12[illegible]

Total Rs. 7273[illegible]

... the Tahsildar further reported that when the Circar Servants measured the land together with Soornad Luyee [?] Lea it appeared there was actual cultivation to the account of Rs 1224/ [illegible]

Subsequent to the receipt of the said [illegible] there was a further cultivation at the Circar rates of — 53 14

These accounts & arzy were forwarded to the Principal Collector, with Yaddasht of the 14 March. —

8. Wishing to see the above accounts and not finding them amongst those sent by the Sherishtadar, which were stated to the only ones existing in his office, I directed the dowl [illegible] accounts to be sent, but it was replied that as the Estate only came into the charge of the Circar in the month of November no dowl or Karrarsugoobady accounts were received. On reference however to the Yaddasht from the late Sub Collector dated as above cited, (14 March) prepared in the Sherishtadar's Cutchery, together with the vernacular correspondence referred to in Para 6 of this Report, it appears that the "Karrarsugoobudy accounts" had been duly forwarded to the Principal Collector, to whom application for inspection thereof was made, & a week afterwards the Sheris-

tadar produced the copy of the accounts which was headed "Sagoobady Jummaa" called in his Nazr accompanying the Sagoobady Ainnah - But after him stating that no such accounts had ever received, it would have been more satisfactory if the Copy had been furnished from this office before the Original had been requested elsewhere. No Copy is however to be found in the Book where it ought to have been, nor does it appear that any separate down accounts had been drawn up -

9 In a Yaddasht dated 17 of March from the Principal Collector, it is observed that the fixed rate & amount of tax appeared to him to be higher than that granted by the Mutahdar's Cowl. It was therefore desired by that Officer to be known what kind of Settlement had been effected whether the rather ryots had taken the Cowls, & if so for how many years did the same extend, with other particulars. Whether or not there existed a single document between the Mutahdar and ryots, and what was the present opinion of the cultivators. observing that without some do-

[illegible] month's depositions the Board of Revenue could not be written to on the subject therefore the former state of the villages and the particulars of the current year with the objections of the ryots should be drawn up for each village together with any agreement there might be forthcoming between the cultivators and the Mutah-dar, & immediately forwarded to the Principal Collector.

10. On the 21st of March these instructions were sent by the Sub Collector to the Tahsildar who in answer thereto on the 31st of the same month, reported that he had sent for the Nattamgars, Curnams and great inhabitants & ascertained that for the Fuslies 1248 – 1249 & 1250 (1838/9 – 1839/40 & 1840/41 A.D.) the ryots of Cusbah Calavacandy received Puttahs from the Mutahdar but for the other 3 Villages the individual Puttahs had only been made for Fusly 1249 (1839/40 A.D.) according to the pleasure of the Mootahdar or acquiescence of the Cultivators, but the reduction did not appear to have been made on the extent of lands nor on a percentage of the rents. That the amount payable by

each was merely reduced in a lump or Puttah
however, had been given for Attiemut Carahag
nyputtah. He therefore received them, but no
Cowlnamahs or Moochelkas passed between
the parties. The Tahsildar further reported
that the land or soil of the Calamandy Mag-
-ah was declared to consist entirely of land
sandy high ground, lime-stone & gravel so
that even after ploughing after the rain fell, the
ground could not contain any moisture.
The produce therefore was most scanty and
inferior and reduced the crops proved un-
remunerative; therefore the ryots desired to
have the Mutahdars rates. That the said
six Statements, taken from the Village officers
were duly forwarded. That in one of them it
would be seen that Cadayyandee Goundan the
Natangar of Calamandy and Poorooloor had
taken the Sethkaragoondan tank in Poor-
-aloor for 22 years from Fusly 1242 to 1263, for
Rupees the year the fixed rent being Rs. 102.13.7 &
hoped the same would be continued to be rented
to him at the same rate. The Tahsildar forward-
-ed a Cowl Puttah for Calamandy & 3 other
Villages, and 13 Arzees for the other 13 Villages
On the 6th of April ... ... with the
forwarded to the Principal Collector, with the
abovesaid documents and the Tahsildar's
Report on the absent & absconded ryots
and, on the 10th idem the Principal Col-
lector directed that ... the ... of
Cultivation

cultivation had paper, it was proper to
collect the rents according to the Mutah-
dars agreements, which were to cease
with that fusly. The Yaddasht of the 14
April, directed the Hoolsoor maf rates
to be adopted the following Fusly, par-
ticulars being given of the cultivation, waste,
&ca. The Soornadhayem was directed to
be struck off by the Yaddasht dated 29th April,
and on the same date a Proclamation
was issued to the effect that from Fusly 1250
A.D. 1840-41
the Hoolsoor maf rates would be maintained

12 On the 29th of June the then Sub Collector
directed the Tahsildar of Chengulpully to procure the
attendance of the ryots of Malamandh on the 2d of
July for the purpose of fixing Cuttahs. The Tah-
sildar stated his inability to attend on account
of the illness of his son, but he sent the Cuttahs
by a Gomastah, & the cultivators by a Tallidar

13 By the Principal Collector's Yaddasht of the
2d of July a true and Cummy account was
required to be drawn up for the said Mutahs & for-
warded to the Tahsildar according to which
he transmitted an account on the 26th. On the
13th of July an order was issued to the Tah-
sildar to [illegible] in 10 days, an account of the
waste, which since the Fusal time, had
been cultivated with garden, and Punjah
cultivated with Nunjah &ca. this was
also sent on the 26th idem.

14 On the 21st December

That for Punjah on old waste — 4
For Punjah changed to garden — 238
on Regular garden lands
Soornadhayem

That in the other 5 villages, on Cawnies 2319 $\frac{11}{16}$ the tax fixed by the Mutahdar was Rupees 54[illegible]-9-14 $\frac{7}{}$ [illegible] in the Jamma-bundy for Pusly 1250 there were Cawnies 1718 $\frac{5}{16}$ assessed [illegible]

Rupees — 4287-9-$\frac{7}{16}$
Soornadhayem — 44-10

The difference between the past and present years being Cawnees 4.601 6/16 or 1137 - 10 - 5 - that of the 77 missing ryots, 3 belonged to Calimand- [illegible], and had gone to Coimbatore, and 1 to the Velloor Mutah; - the remaining 73 had abandoned their lands & lived by daily labour, not being able to give the increased tax. The Village Officers had given such statements which were forwarded with the Accounts -

17. In December 1841 I joined the district and on the 25th of July 1842 a yaddast was sent from the Principal Coll- to send for that Fusly (1252 / A.D. 1842/3) two Zilladars to see the Culti- vation examine the produce [illegible] and to remain there till further [illegible] rendering periodical accounts of the same; and the Tasildar directed to superintend the whole - Further that the land should be measured and the produce thrashed and examined - The requi- site instructions were issued accordingly; and a year subsequent the 11th of August 1843, the Tasildar wanted for the services the said Zilladars in their own Firkas; to which the Princl Collector assented -

18. A month after I was relieved from the duties of the Zillah Court or 24 October 1843 - I submitted a short report briefly exhibitive of my opinion touching the total absence of the necessity for any diminution of the land tax - although the accounts & records in my possession were exceedingly few, they were sufficient to induce a suspicion that some conceal- ment at least had taken place respecting other resources and [illegible] of the estate, because the Proprietor had proved for a series of years the profits arising therefrom, and not being aware of the Reports which had preceded it to the Board of

Revenue, I merely forwarded such Statements as had been [illegible]
-red in the Talook. The Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated
the 6 of February 1845 were received with your letter of the 5 of [illegible]
requesting me to proceed with my Establishment to the Muttah and
-tend to the reaping thrashing and measuring of the crop in some [illegible]
in different Villages, and to use exertion in procuring the accounts of
Cultivation & Collections for the last 10 or 12 years during the Managem[ent]
of the Mutahdar either from the Muttahdar villages Curnoms or
renters, & also to endeavor to ascertain whether any of the ryots have
been duly withdrawn from the Calamandy Estate to the [illegible]
[illegible] to extend the cultivation of the latter to the prejudice of the
former —

19 By the above it was perceived the Species of information
which had not been supplied but was urgently required to enable
the Board of Revenue to pass a decision on the matter, no confi-
dence could be placed in the Statements of the Curnoms, or even
of Muttahdars respecting the produce of the land but even with
their attempts in a season far from favorable the necessity for
any reduction was not obvious, because the accounts of the Cur-
noms could scarcely have referred to more than a single crop
as this however is not specified the surest way is to place [no]
confidence whatever on their Statement for if from a sin-
gle crop of garden produce, and one harvest from a field sown
with 2 or 3 kinds of grain the result would be fallacious
& totally useless, but if on the entire produce of the land thro-
-out the season, it is particularly false on receipt of your
letter of the 5 of March 1845, there was no Punjah Standing

[illegible]ny part of the District, nor any garden produce fit for the [illegible]ekte.

20 In June however after my return from Tencarry I proceeded to the Cusbah Calamandhy and measured the produce of [a g]arden belonging to one Vella Gownden in Tambechampollem [in] the Cusbah Village of Calamandhy. I found the same in [s]heaves and a small portion of it was not quite ripe, and could not therefore be thrashed. The field consisted of 3 22/16 goontahs assessed at Rs. 8 - 8 - 9 average per goontah after deducting the Hoolsar mof[?] of 12/4 Cally fanams - On entering the field I first directed an estimate to be made

		Callams
[Th]e Curnom gave it as his opinion there were		16
The Nattamagar	D°	18
An Officer of the Cutchery	D°	20
The Nattamagar of a neighbouring village	D°	24
[The] Sub Collector	D°	24

The result of the thrashing and measuring (leaving the portion that was unripe) proved that there were 26 Calm. 19 Mr. which at 1½ Rupees[*] the average price of a Callam of Cholum would give Rupees 42 - 3 - 3 Thus for 2/2 Crops per annum or 5 Crops in two years would give

	Rs	A	P
in two years would give	100	6	8
Cultivators Share	50	3	4
Remainder for the landlord or Puttahdar	50	3	4
Circar Tax	8	8	9
Remains a clear profit for the Land lord or about [?]00 per cent	41	10	7

[*] The average price during the present year is Rs 1½

283

[illegible] on [illegible] in the [illegible]
for [illegible] [illegible]
ought to be [illegible] [illegible]
profession [illegible] [illegible]
or on the [illegible] [illegible]
the same [illegible] [illegible]
tax on the land but its [illegible]
the necessity of [illegible]
ing his cattle [illegible]
value of the Cholum [illegible]
field was considered from its [illegible]
ten Rupees. It is the property of [illegible]
ing ryot. The above shows a [illegible]
profit to the land-lord on each [illegible]
cultivated for nearly [illegible] per [illegible]
which betokens [illegible] further than
inferiority of land [illegible]
loss to those engaged [illegible]
ther Proprietor or Cultivator.

[illegible] Another field of Cholum [illegible]
by me in the Village of [illegible]
the possession of one [illegible]
and consisted of 3 [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible]
sessed at 14/16 [illegible]
[illegible] the [illegible]
assessment, [illegible] the produce
was 19/4 [illegible]
would give Rs 128 [illegible]
ryot was fortunate [illegible]
[illegible] crops, the [illegible] Cholum
which taken to be equivalent to the

[illegible] which it could only be [illegible]

[illegible] with Cultivation valued at Rs 28-14

[illegible] crop [illegible] which the Curnum [illegible]

[illegible] Ruleivans the produce

[illegible] Rs 28 The 3 crops

[illegible] amounted to Rupees — 105-12

[illegible] Shares of [illegible] value

[illegible] of the [illegible] — 52-14

[illegible] share — 52-14

[illegible] — 9-14

[illegible] profit to the Putkadar, or

[illegible] 50 per cent — 43

[illegible] as nearly as nature

[illegible] and was then [illegible]

[illegible] generally [illegible]

[illegible] with the said grain

[illegible] arrival, and heard

[illegible] large supplies were despatch[ed]

[illegible] the Calavenady Estate

[illegible] the village of [illegible] During

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] the crop

[illegible] & in the second

[illegible] in my presence

[illegible] ripe

[illegible] The results [illegible] given are

[illegible] rather than an excess of the

[illegible]

[illegible] account of the [illegible] Estate

[illegible] received from the [illegible]

[illegible] and the [illegible]

[illegible] sources of information

[illegible] [illegible]

285

[illegible] attachable to the [illegible]
Statements [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] to differ [illegible] [illegible]
they [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible]
been [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] before [illegible]
also differ [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to
Board from [illegible] Principal Officers
whilst the [illegible] [illegible]
themselves [illegible] [illegible]
too were delivered to me by the [illegible]
which had the most [illegible] appe
[illegible], & it seemed absolutely [illegible]
a fair exact Report [illegible]
[illegible] were required from me [illegible]
all the instructions [illegible] the
Statute [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
the Principal Officer to [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
a Book Officers, and others [illegible]
to ascertain [illegible] there were [illegible]
stantial grounds for supposing [illegible]
[illegible] existed. That period [illegible]
being the [illegible] of the [illegible]
[illegible] I [illegible] [illegible]
for completion of the investigation [illegible]
the beginning of [illegible]
I should then [illegible]
same [illegible] of [illegible]
fully [illegible] whole of the [illegible]

The increase [illegible] the Rev. was [illegible] above the previous [illegible]

[illegible] personally examine the [illegible]
[illegible] villages & thus seperate the
[illegible] [illegible] have the [illegible]
[illegible] documents and explanation
[illegible] not easily to be reconciled, &
[illegible] such documents as would tend
[illegible] advance the capabilities &
[illegible] the real State
[illegible] inhabitants as well as of the cult-
[illegible] and compared with the
[illegible] statements of the village
[illegible] & determine the necessity
[illegible] otherwise, of a permanent reduction
[illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] the above purposes I pro-
[illegible] the [illegible] to the [illegible]
[illegible] indisposition prevented
[illegible] [illegible] in [illegible] -
[illegible] the result of a few fields ex-
[illegible] which [illegible] separate account
II [illegible] accompanies this Report, is
[illegible] shew that there is not any total
[illegible] profit to the actual cultivator
[illegible] Land-lord, that the Zemindar
[illegible] unable to maintain the
[illegible] rates and that there is
[illegible] necessity for a reduction
[illegible] tax of the [illegible] of
[illegible] there is any of the
[illegible] [illegible] Statement
[illegible] of which [illegible]

Coleroon [illegible] Mannargudy [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

tam, Palappanpatti, Devatoty, Bodduvarpatti

287 and Pulampatti of Mannarchellum [illegible] [illegible]

that, compared with the field produce, the tax w[as]

far lighter in the Catamungy estate than in

their Villages, & some of them were present du-

ring my examination of the produce.

24. It having been discovered that Deposi[tions]

had been sworn by the [illegible] [illegible]

and certain Reports of Calamundy [illegible]

the late Tahsildar respecting the state of the [illegible]

& produce with profit & welfare of the culti[va-]

tors, — the said documents were [illegible] for, an[d]

found to contain statements so much at vari-

ance with the truth, as to render it necessary

to examine the Village officers on the subject.

The papers stated the poverty of, and diffi-

culty in working, the ground, the scanty fall

of rain, and even with reduction the

unremunerative nature of the [illegible]

as stated in the 10th Para of the Report.

When these were read over to those

of the officers & cultivators whose signa-

Copies tures were attached to them, they

declared they had never given such

statements. That they were [illegible]

to sign certain papers [illegible] [illegible]

so that all statements [illegible] [illegible]

very perfectly mature, the cultivated
[illegible] was not of the said description; the
language used moreover was not even in
that of their part of the country.

For the ascertaining the state
of the lands I had already examined
the [illegible] in the occupation of the Na-
tamgar of Poonatoor on the border of that
Village & Coslam avoy. I found it of the best
description but on suspicion touching its
extent I directed it to be measured & as
there was much difference in the survey [illegible]
I determined on immediately measuring
all the fields under cultivation. For Cottum
Varahooghery cotty. I appointed the
Tenstadar Ventrain Row who arrived
the previous evening after the threshing
& examination of the crops were completed
the Hoozoor Gomastah Streeneewasa Row,
& the Tangachyanapettah Curnum Go-
mastah Thawaloy Pillay & that Frika
[illegible] Soobiah together with
the Curnum, Natamgar and others of those
Villages

For Sarumpatty and Chinnavilam-
patty the Tavah [illegible]

289

[illegible]

only [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] with the [illegible]

and [illegible] the [illegible]

for [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] and other [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible]

20. [illegible]

in [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]							
12 [illegible]	2061 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
1254	2862	52	7712	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Increase	799	[illegible]	1150	27	17	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

290

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

292

[illegible]

to the [illegible]

Estate [illegible]

with the Deed of [illegible]

the [illegible] probability [illegible]

to [illegible]

[illegible]

a [illegible] very different [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the Proprietors [illegible]

It certainly appears [illegible] the [illegible]

had been [illegible]

[illegible]

the Estate to the [illegible] of the Commissioners [illegible]

[illegible]

Poor [illegible]

of [illegible] complained [illegible] class [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

to the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

was [illegible]

29. [illegible]

29 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] not to [illegible] of the

In the 3d article of the [illegible]

[illegible] the proposal following [illegible] it was

[illegible] that the [illegible] of Columbia [illegible]

[illegible] according to the [illegible]

[illegible]

295

2956

[illegible] appears [illegible]

[illegible] in amount [illegible]

Cover taking the estate [illegible]

superintendence, and [illegible]

puttahs also for the following year [illegible]

eighty one proper proceedings [illegible]

puttah [illegible] does not [illegible]

the assertion, he apparently attempt [illegible]

the proceeding by stating that as the estate was his

own, he had a right to do what he pleased [illegible]

acted accordingly. It appears that [illegible]

and puttahs, were [illegible]

[illegible] that [illegible]

[illegible] received [illegible] 1250 [illegible]

puttahs were distributed [illegible]

puttahs were given, which [illegible]

to shew that [illegible]

[illegible] puttah [illegible]

[illegible] decided [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] for the [illegible]

[illegible] by the [illegible]

by the [illegible]

of the [illegible] of the [illegible]

1250. The [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of the

[illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] to the

[illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible] report of the said

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of the

[illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible] likely to be

[illegible] further [illegible]

[illegible] to the

[illegible] by the Board

[illegible] of the [illegible] Branch

[illegible] of the Report

[illegible] of that

[illegible] for that purpose

[illegible]

[illegible] that the

[illegible] from the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] they [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] difficulty

[illegible]

Vide [illegible]

[illegible]

248.

[illegible]

300

~~299~~

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] that [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] considering the [illegible]

[illegible] that the [illegible]

[illegible] that [illegible]

[illegible] perfect the [illegible]

therefore [illegible]

to be [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] July 1829 [illegible]

[illegible] the highest [illegible] defined

[illegible] in specifying

[illegible] the balance

[illegible] be considered as a

[illegible] the Board [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 201 [illegible]

[illegible] and ordered [illegible] attached to [illegible]

[illegible] available [illegible]

direct that, [illegible]

fine, under such [illegible]

[illegible] to [illegible]

[illegible] in [illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible] of the Board [illegible]

[illegible] found.

35. [illegible]

[illegible] and [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible]

[illegible] its preparation [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] any [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of the [illegible]

that the [illegible]

[illegible] for the [illegible]

[illegible] the proceedings [illegible]

[illegible]

whatever else may be [illegible]

The [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

202

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant

(Signed) W. Elliot

Sub Collector

True copy

W. Blackburne

Pt Clerk

302 No. 269 208 303 304

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of
Madura

Annainacknoor 5th June 184[illegible]
Recd. [illegible]

Sir

1 On the 20th of February last I had the honor to bring to your notice the claims of the various parties desiring the Curnumship of Arjulepatty, one of whom I had selected & subsequently recommended, but in consequence of it being considered that the said individual brotherinlaw a former Curnum had been dismissed the petitioner against the said selec[tion] was considered to have a prior claim & wa[s] appointed according to the instructions contain[ed] in your letter of the 25th Idem.

2 It was not known to me at the tim[e] that Appavoo Pillay, the person proposed by the Tahsildar & selected by one was the brotherinlaw of any dismissed Curnum, but his claims were of themselves so great that it did not appear of much consequence whether it where true or not; as however the statement was considered acquiesced in by [illegible] on account of

of my silence which was very far from my intent, I sent an order to the Tahsildar on the 6th of March to report on the subject.

3 On the 23rd of March Palaniandy Pillay the son of the Tysul Curnum Soobramaniapillay presented a petition stating that the statement to the effect that his father had ever been dismissed was perfectly false, that he hoped the duty would be given to himself, but if not he hoped his Brotherinlaw Appavoo Pillay would be appointed. That he had been absent at Vadiputty since Tusly 1236.
AD 1826

4 On the 29th of March the Tahsildar reported that there was a Curnum named Soobrammaniah pillay who had been dismissed but he was no relation to the Tysul Curnum of the same name, nor to any of the present parties, being from Subkamputty of the Melore Talook. The deceased Veerpoory Pillay was appointed on the 31st of October 1835 to act till

the Appearance of the Fysul Curnum
Soobramnaniah pillay as appears from
the Copy of the Takeed of that date.
The said Vyapoory pillay was suspended
for 1 year for fraud in the Villages
accounts & a petition was presented
against him for appropriating 20 Rs.
of the Circar Money, but it was not
established in the Talook. The Tahsil
-dar reported this on the 10th of April
last; But I have so occupied with the
settlement of the Division & other current
work that I have not had leisure till
this date, to submit this further explanation
with the Documents connected therewith

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
[signature]
Sub Collector

Amainatkroor
Sub Colrs Cachry
5th June 1846
Recd 8th JB

No 269

From the Sub Coller
5th June 1846

[illegible]

No. 271

308

307

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of

Madura

Dindigul 6th June 1846

Recd 8th Jn

Sir

I have the honor to return duly corrected the lists of Public Buildings received back with your letter of the 7th Ultimo. The discrepancies appear to have arisen chiefly from the Verandahs being added together instead of being separately given. The lists now sent are pronounced by the Tahsildar to be correct but I believe they are — the Meah pathas & Eighty accounts are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

[illegible]
Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Colrs Cutcherry
6th June 1846

8th Jn

No 271.

From the Sub
Coll dated
June 1840

318

346

No. 289.

339

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of

Madura

Palany 16th June 1846

Recd 18th do

Sir

I have the honor to inform you with refe[illegible] your letter of the 1st Inst No 396 that Pichamoottoo & Vencatachellam Pillay both claim the credit of sublet-ting for 1255 the same parcel of ground which the former engaged to cultivate during Fusly 1253. It appears however that for the Present Fusly 1255, Vencata-chellampilly has possessed the land & paid the kists & Pitchamoottoo has no right to that land & lays no claim to any other. I do not think it possible to make any further collections from Pichamoottoo, & if you should be of the same opinion it would probably be

better

better to obtain permission for Striking off the balance from the accounts.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servt

[illegible]
Sub Collector

Palamy (?)
Sub Collrs Cachery
16th June 1846
Recd 18th (?)

From the Sub Collector
16th June 1846

No. 294 348 341

From the Sub Collector
To The Principal Collector of Madura

Palany 10th June 1840.
Recd 18th do

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the Receipt of your letter of the 1st Instant No. 395 and to state that on the request of the Pruttuvelapah Naick that I would take Evidence to prove he had not been hung and that he was the same individual whom a former Tahsildar had declared not to have been hang whilst all the Zemindars and respectable inhabitants who were his relatives, were ready to bear testimoney, as they had before done that he was the son of the 4th wife of Kuppa Naick; I considered there could be no possible objection to so simple a Proceeding - I have not the documents before me to be able to answer your questions in detail, but if my passing an opinion to the Effect that Pruttuvelapa Naick was not hung be considered irregular or incorrect; I request my Endorsement to that Effect may be cancelled and should it be at variance with any orders hitherto passed by you, of which I have not been put in possession, I beg to apologise. - I imagined my

predecessor

predecessor had passed in the year 1840 a similar opinion to my own. I believe my only proceeding has been to state that the individual before me who was proved to be Mutuvelapah Naik had never been hung though his father was, but I directed him to the Civil Court if he intended to found any family right or previlege on the discovery. I can only express my regret and solicit the favor of a return of the said indorsement.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) W. Elliot
Sub Collr.

Palany
Sub Collrs. Cutchery
16th June 1840
Recd 18th J B

(True Copy)
J Blackburne
G. Clr

From the Sub Collr 16th June 1840

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(True Copy)
(Signed) W. Elliot
Sub Collector

True copy J. Blackburne
T'lr

345

Indorsement

In consequence of the desire of Moot toonela ppah Naik residing at Cosavapetty attached to the Zemindary of Venoopakshy belonging to Zoomfully Talook to examine certain witnesses to prove identity and that he is the son of the fourth lawful wife of the late Zemindar Coppala Naik of Venoopakshy after a careful perusal of all the depositions. It appears that on account of the sentences of death pronounced & carried into execution by Mr Hurdis against his father Coppala Naik. Moottoonelappa Naik through fear left the District & that during his absence his younger brother Poonnayah Naik the son of the sixth wife of the said Coppalah Naik presented himself and to him an allowance was given by the Circar. that after some time, Petitioner returned to Cosavapetty and preferred petitions on the subject

in due form in Mr. Peter's time stating that he has sole right to the said Zemindary and he hoped for an allowance; It seems that on this occasion Petitioner's younger brother Ponnapah Naik (Father of the present Zemindar) and others endeavored to shew that he (Petitioner) was a Dasiri or religious mendicant and again that he was a Chetty both of which could not be true but both were perfectly false and unfounded -

According to an order issued from the Joint Magistrate's office dated 14th October 1836 respecting the right of holding the Zemindary Shama Row the then Tasildar of Iyempully talook investigated the case & forwarded 45 Documents on the 5th of January 1837 from all which it appears that the said Ponnapah Naik (father of Annapa Naik) had stated that the petitioner was a Chetty &ca merely with the intention of usurping the Estate or allowance. The Tasildar pronounced Petitioner the real heir and there

appears not the least doubt of the said Moo-
toovelapah Naik being the true born son of
Nagammal 4th wife of Cooppala Naik and
that he is therefore the rightful heir to the
said Zemindary. Moreover the Cummacody,
Devarum, Yeuttamanaikunoor & Madoor
Zemindars have given written statements
that the said Moottoovelapah Naik both
before and after his quitting the District
married females of their own caste and
relatives of those Zemindars respectively,
to whom therefore heir by marriage connected.

Without going further into de-
=tail or exhibiting the very improper means
adopted to annihilate the right of the pe-
=titioner Moottoovelapah Naik. It will
suffice to state that the evidence desired
to be taken has been recorded, but the Sub
Collector cannot interfere touching the
matters of right which must be settled
before the higher authority or any Court of Law.

Copies of any documents taken can only be supplied on receipt of a letter from such Court or other authority but a list of those documents recently taken in this matter may be given.

Dindigul
Sub Collr's Cutcherry
9th April 1846

(Signed) W. Elliot
Sub Collector

True copy
(Signed) W. Elliot
Sub Collector

True copy
J. Blackburne
Collr

358 No. 305 341

Madura 1st August 1840
Recd 1st [illegible]

To The Principal Collector
of Madura

Sir

I have the honor to re-
-quest you will furnish me
with the Iypal Oloogoo ac-
-count of the Village of Nal-
-lamanacotay in Tandicombo
Talook to enable me to dispose
of a complaint regarding
transfer of Iyan to Man-
-iem land

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servt.

[illegible]
for Sub Collr.

No 305

From Mr Blackburn
for Sub Collector
1st August 1846

No. 279

334

From The Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of

Madura

Palany 12th June 1846

Recd 14th

Sir

I have the honor to enclose an addr[illegible]

received from the Tahseldar of Iyem[illegible]

pilly on the subject of the new step [illegible]

required to the Jungow on the Ammara[illegible]

ooty. He proposes that the railing [illegible]

should not be cut on the opposite side [illegible]

the accommodation of the said step [illegible]

I believe such injury to the frame ha[illegible]

never been in contemplation, but as mos[illegible]

[illegible]

other orders on the subject have been received
from the Principal Cachry. This reference
is made for your opinion..

Palany
Sub Coltrs Cachry
12th June 1846

R. 14th JB

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant
[signature]
Sub Collector

No 279

To
the Principal Collector of
Madura

358

371

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

Unanswered 10th July

No. 282

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of

Madura

Palany 15th June 1846

Recd 16th JB

Sir

I have the honor to bring to your notice that at the end of October last a petition without date No. 1849/1845 was presented to me by Anantanarayanah of Neelmangalam to the effect that one Lolla Naga of Neelmangalam had taken possession of certain land which was included in a parcel which had been granted to him on the 19th of January 1841, 4 years before upon ½ tax as Nunjah or Punjah. This petition was sent to the Tahsildar for report & his answer with documents were referred to the Dufter for the necessary order which was there prepared & dispatched directing to the effect that the land belonged to the Complainant

& if he did not cultivate it, the same might be given to the Defendant. Against this order the said Defendant Lālla Naga presented a petition on the 16th Ultimo (No. 677 of 46) requesting me to reinspect the Documents & grant him the said land. I have perused the Documents and cannot support the order prepared by my Sheristahdar which as the case appeared simple I entrusted to his opinion. It appears that although the disputed piece of land ($3\frac{1}{8}$ Guntahs) is included in one & the same parcel consisting of $21\frac{7}{16}$ Guntahs, situated in Defendant's Village, Keelmangalam & which Pltff & others took as above stated, $10\frac{3}{4}$ Guntahs only of which they cultivated & that with Nunjah in contravention of the terms of their cowl, which was thereby forfeited. The remainder of the Number, or about half the parcel, was left waste & to such therefore the complainant Anantanarainah could

have

have no possible right and consequently there existed no real objection to Lala Miyah's Cultivation. The Tahsildar took the same view of the case, and I therefore request you will grant me authority to recal or cancel my former order on the subject dated 2d March 1846, with the view to passing an award in favor of Lala Miyah; or, as I expect so shortly to leave the Division, I request, should you be pleased to coincide with my opinion of the case, you will issue instructions direct to the Tahsildar of Tenkarey -

2 In the above said ½ number, after deducting the land occupied by Lala Miyah there remained 7 6/16 Goontahs in which Cavery Soobbiah of Neelmangalam took, on the permission of the Natamgar, 3 4/16 Guntas Anontien of Nelmongalam stated that he ploughed the same. 10 Witnesses of Neelmongalam deposed in favor of Anontien & 13 Witnesses in favor of Cavery Soobbiah

In this matter also the order was prepared in the Duftur & against it the Defendant presented me a petition dated the 25th of March. On referring the same to the Talook, it appears that whatever right, Anantien might originally have possessed, it was cancelled by his own act, & he even resigned the same; & having no right whatever, whilst Cavery Soobbiah has paid the Kist & obtained the receipt for the same, I request you will in this case also give me authority for recalling the order of the 21st of February which bears my signature, but which I am unable to support, or that you will forward such instructions direct[illegible] as you may be pleased to consider called for.

3. The Records in both cases accompany this letter.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
[signature]
Sub Collector

Palany
Sub Coll. Cachery
15th June 1846

Recd 16th [illegible]

No 282

No. 288 342

337

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of

Madura

Palany 16th June 1846

Recd 17th JB

Sir

1 In reply to the 2d Para of your letter of the 1st Inst on the subject of the Sendy or Natangar I have the honor to enclose the depositions given by the Curnums & the Natamgars &c. of the Hamlets included in that village by which it appears that the whole demand against the Natamgar Bommenaick appears

Rs. 54-5-5 to have arisen from money which he had collected but not carried to account. He occupied no land beyond his maneum which he fully cultivated, his ryot's name is Veeranen. He cultivated the whole also this year, but has left no property. His brother Kamnen has one plough & 3 Rs. land, their parents, yet alive, are said to gain their livelihood by daily labor or he

The

The Value of Bommynaik's Maniem is 11¼ poontahs of Punjah the tax on which would be Rs 9 : 8 . 10 (Poons ft. 4 . 15) & his cultivation Cumboo, Shamey & grain of which his ryot took half. Bomme Naik had no puttah this year also.

2 With respect to the Balance of money collected but not delivered by him, he promised to pay the same in 2 months & there was no other way of collecting it, for he possessed no ostensible property. He has however absconded. The Curnum states that he does not know who is his security, so an order was issued to the Tahsildar of Nellocottah on the 2nd & 16th Ulto to ascertain who he is & his state. A circular order has also this day been issued to the Different Tahsildars of the Sub Division to report carefully on the existence & property of all securities for the Village Officers.

314

3 On the departure of Bommenaik the Tahsildar of Nellacottah immediately appointed a Natamgar of one of the hamlets included in the said Village Rasidany Bommenaik to act for him till another should be appointed –

4 Copies of the orders issued in the matter of the said Natamgar are herein enclosed for your inspection.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant
W. Elliot
Sub Collector

Pelany
Sub Collector's Cachery
5th June 1846
Recd 17 JB

No 288

From the Sub
Collr 16th June
1846

No. 306 358

Madura 1st August 1846.
Recd 1st [illegible]

To
The Principal Collector of
Madura. 357

Sir,

I have the honor to return the Tysal Ooloogoo accounts of Pal-lapatty as received from your Office which were mistakenly applied for instead of for Strotrium Cooroom-bapatty in Taudicomboo, & request you will furnish me with the latter to enable me to dispose of a Com-plaint before me.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obdt. Servt.
J. W. Lebeuner
for Sub Collr.

No 306

From Mr Blac

for Lieut Colte

1st August 18

360
353

No. 316

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of

Madura

Dindigul 6th August 1846
Recd 8th JD

Sir

I have the honor to enclose the receipt of 2d Dresser Maduramoottoo Pillay on account of his pay for the Month of July last.

Dindigul ....
Sub Collectors Cacherry
6th August 1846
Recd 8th JD

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
[illegible]
Sub Collector

No 310

From the Secy

Colo & Aug

1840

56 Received 8 August 1846

355.

Proposed indorsement on Petition No 764 of 1846 addressed to the Board of Revenue by Sellakomara Goundern and others of Cuttamandy in Tyempilly

The Ryots of Cuttah Calamandy having in a petition to the Sub Collector dated 27 of May (No 740 of 46) stated that the entry of certain lands in that village was in excess of what they possessed, the matter was referred to the Tahsildar of Tyempilly for report as he had measured the lands of the said village - He reported that the 10th 27 July he and others were guarantees for the correctness of the said accounts; and that the Ryots had received their Puttahs, and there was no balance against them

The Petition to the Board of Revenue is
therefore returned as the Petitioners
having nothing to urge, have acknow-
ledged the correctness of the measure-
ments &c by the receipt of their puttahs
and full satisfaction of the demand -

Divi digned

W. D. Neil.
Collect

6 August 1846

Recd Sr M

364

No. 326

357

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of
Madura

Dindigul 17th August 1846.
Recd 19th [illegible]

Sir

By the enclosed address of the Tahsildar of Tangera dated 2d Instant and which in the first instance probably was dispatched to Madura and has since been sent to the Sheristadar, it appears that the widow of the late Zemindar of Devadhanapatty Chinnammal who died on the 6th Ultimo, has left no Children that her next of kin are said to be Yerrachinnama Naiken and her sisterinlaw Sertamal, both of whom are in the Yelamally Zemindary situated in the Province of Tinnevelly. The amount of property left by deceased is Rupees 164 - 15 - 6. The former address from the Tahsildar dated 12th July and Natamgars Report are also herewith forwarded

Dindigul
Sub collectors Cutchery
17th August 1846
Recd 19th [illegible]

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
[illegible]
Sub Collector

No 326

From the Sab[illegible]

7th Augt 1840

No. 350. 359 366

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of
Madura

Dindigul 31st August 1846
Recd 4 Septr JB

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th Instant No. 657 requiring the original Purwanah granting the Cazy maniem of Gungwarpatty, the 5th of the Documents in the list furnished by the Tahsildar, but beg to state in reply that the original document was never furnished; only the copy of the Purwanah which was duly submitted to you with the Tahsildar's arzy of the 2d Instant; the original Purwanah will be sent for —

Dindigul
Sub Collectors Cutcherry
31st August 1846
Recd 4 Septr JB

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
J. Elliot
Sub Collector

No 350

From the Lab: Coler
31st Augt 1846

No. 358

3.68
361

From the Sub Collector.

To the Principal Collector

of Madura

Dindigul 1st September 1810
Recd 4th D.

Sir I have the honor to inform you that after receipt of your letter of the 23rd of May last on the 1st of June one of the Petitions therein received No. 24 of 1810 purporting to be from the Ryots of Poddu... and others, dated 27th July and ... to the Board of Revenue was dispatched to the Tahsildar of ... for investigation ... the district on the 1st of June within which time the reply had not been received - During my absence the case was called for from the Talook on the 24th of June and 5th and 27th of July and by myself after arrival on the 6th and 30 ultimo upon a petition received from the Defendent and the Muzumdar having Completed the case has this day Submitted his report in the depositions taken &c. -

Summary

2. It appears that the Petition bears the mark or signature of 103 persons of whom only 52 were present, the remaining 53 were not be found, and it is not shewn whether they ever existed -

3. With reference to the subjects contained in the petition nothing is stated except in a general way, but every portion is false

the

The first item respects certain lands granted on Cowl to one of the Cultivators Pillapah Setty who must be considered the Dependent (accidentally entered in the English Abstract on the said petition as Mootoo Pilly). But as the Mugumdar remarks he has held those lands for 5 years without the slightest objection whilst it was on the statement of those very individuals who sign the present petition, that there existed no objection; that the lands which had laid waste for 22 years were made over to Pillapah Setty the present occupant: yet the Petitioners or rather those who drew up the petition (and there is a very great difference between those parties) would wish it to appear that their own lands had been violently taken from them by the Deft.

4. The next point is the flooding of the Village by Defendants determination to secure ~~an unusual~~ supply of water for his Cultivation - The Mugumdar proce[illegible] the shot & pronounces the statement false, as well as the assertion of the Deft levying a fine for Stray or trespassing Cattle - and appropriating the produce of the Ryots fruit trees -

5 One most extraordinary assertion is made viz. that the following Petitions had been presented by them within the last 3 y[illegible]

To the Principal Collector 1 or 2

To the Sub Collector ... Sixteen

and Joint magistrate ten

Whilst there is not the slightest recollection to myself or any connected with this Cutcherry of a single individual

amongst them ever having presented one on any subject; and fifty out of the Fifty two present deny ever having seen any! This is really a very improper affair; and it is very [illegible]satisfactory for any officer to have his time taken up with an examination into a Series of Charges and assertions for which there was not the slightest shadow of a foundation. The real getters up of the petition are evidently those who have Courage to do all but appear, sign or substantiate, when an opportunity is offered, the statements made; and such proceedings should be put a stop to as speedily as possible

6. The proposed draft of an endorsement is herein enclosed

Dinigul
Sub Collectors Cutcherry
14th September 1846

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. servant
W. Elliot
Sub Collector

Recd 4th JB

No 358
From the Subscriber.
1st Septr 1846

Received 4 September 1846 [illegible]   365 ; 57.

36A

Proposed endorsement on Petition No. 211 of 1846 dated 27th January and presented to the Board of Revenue by Cadersawmynaick and others of Puddaputty attached to Tadikamboo in the District of Madura

The Complaints and other Statements Contained in this Petition although not mentioned in precise detail, have been examined by the Mujumdar of Tadikombo and proved to be untrue

[illegible]

Sub Collector

No. 363 374

From the Sub Collector 367

To the Principal Collector

of Dindigul

[illegible] 1846

Recd 6 [illegible]

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 31st Ultimo No. 661 with a Petition addressed to the Board of Revenue by Mootoosawmy naick of Cunniampatty in the [illegible] Zemindary of Tenkarrey claiming the [illegible] of the said Village, and in reply beg to inform you that the draft of an endorsement to meet the said case was laid before you with my letter of the 26th of March last No. 116 and no further investigation or order appears necessary but shall be happy to enter on such, if required.

675
1846

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. Servant

Dindigul
Sub Collectors Cutcherry
4th September 1846
Recd 6 [illegible]

[illegible]
Sub Collector

No 365

~~From the Lab[oratory]~~

~~4th Septem[ber] 1846~~

No. 384 376 ~~374~~

369

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector
of Madura

Dindigul 17th September 1846
Recd 19 do

Sir In reply to your letter of the 1st Ultimo requiring certain 4 witnesses to be examined by the Tahsildar of Vellacottah in the matter of Vencatamma of Bullagoantah I have the honor to state that they have been examined and the Tahsildar reports in his arzy of the 3rd Instant that although the pattah is in the name of Kristnamah Setty the land should be enjoyed equally by both parties for which arrangement or decision, I request your sanction –

Dindigul
Sub Collector Cutchery
17th September 1846

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt servant
[signature]
Sub Collector

Disp 18 do
Recd 19 do

No 384

From the Sub
Collr 17 Septr
1846

No. 385 378 371

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of
Madura

Dindigul 17th Septr 1846
Recd 19th JD

Sir

I have the honor to submit an address dated 31st Ultimo received from the Tahsildar of Dindigul in consequence of the receipt of your order of the 29th of July last to examine into the wish of the Ryots of Callimputtee to have Appahsamiah as their Natamgar in lieu of Muruganadan. The Tahsildar states the said Muruganadan, who is the Jysal Meerasidar, to be negligent which is probably the case & recommends the change, which if it meet your approval I shall be glad to be favored with your instructions. This

record

record was sent to the Dufter but return[ed]
and I have been prevented by other work from
taking it up before this.

Dindigul
Sub Collr. Cutchery
17th Septr. 1846

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servt.
[illegible]
Sub Collector

Disp. 18 Sept.
Recd 19th JB

From the Sub
Collector 17
Septr. 1846

No. 429

~~378~~ 380
379

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura
Dindigul 15th October 1846
Recd 17th

Sir,

1. I have the honor to bring to your notice for the purpose of obtaining your advice or instructions a point connected with the settlement on certain lands in the village of Manjenaikenpatty attached to the Mutah of Velur in the Iyempilly Talook.

2. It appears to have been the invariable practice for the Ryots to compound or bargain for their possessions or holdings without reference to actual cultivation of species of produce, and this without reference to the land or Village being sub-rented, or under the immediate charge of the Muttahdar. The village of Manjenaikenpatty is at present under the charge of the Circar on account of arrears stated to be due to the Muttadar; but the tax having to be fixed on the several holdings it is necessary to determine on what principle the same should be settled on such lands as either at the Tysul time

times or since, have been entered and generally or in part cultivated as Garden.

3. The practice which obtains in the Dindigul division on the Amany lands is that if for sufficient reason Punjah is cultivated in Baghat or Totakal, the Punjah tax alone is leviable. In this, the custom differs from that prevailing in Madura where the simple option of the party cultivating determines the kind of produce and therefore himself settles, without reference to any authority, the amount of tax leviable. And such too appears to be the practice in all Zemindaries and Mutahs where no regular agreement or pattah is for a series of years, without reference to produce, exists. And even in Teukarry during the settlement for the past Fusly (1255) when on Circuit, the Principal Collector was pleased to direct that a certain Ryot of the Village of Cumbum should pay tax for his land with reference to the species of cultivation, and the demand was therefore fixed at half the

the said garden rate — This is but fair in cases where there is no reason to believe, concealment or other fraudulent means or powers on the part of the Ryot and I regret your sanction therefore for the adoption of the same rate in the Jeffeed villages of the Estate, as it would certainly bear very hardly on the Ryots to introduce an arrangement to their immediate detriment without previous notice to them on the part of the Muttahdar.

4. I beg therefore to recommend that all garden lands or portions thereof cultivated as such be taxed accordingly, but that all similar lands actually occupied with Punjah produce pay only half garden Tax up to the close of Fusly 1255, and for the Current season be placed on an equality with the Amany Lands under similar circumstances, due notice being given to the Cultivators and the Muttahdar to that effect.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obed^t. Servt.

[signature]
Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Collector's Cutchery
15th October 1846.

Rec^d 17th J.B.

No. 429

From the Lab Colle

18th October
1840

No. 446 384 377

From the Sub Collector,
To the Principal Collector of Madura
Dindigul 31st October 1846
Recd 31st JB

Sir,

I beg to inform you that in consequence of the subject contained in Government Petition No. 1244 of 1846 presented by the Vakeel of Vencatachella Pilly adopted son of Tiruvengadam Pilly who claimed the Zemindary of 6 Villages in Iyempilly not being known in this office an order was sent to the Tahsildar of that Talook on the 15th Instant and the draft of an endorsement will be submitted as required by your letter of the 10th Instant on receipt of the desired information.

[...]ted [...]ptet. [...]1846.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servt.
[signature]
Sub Collector

[D]indigul
3[1]st October 1846
[...] Collector's Cutchery
[...] 31st JB

From the Author
31st Octr 1846

No. 443

386

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 30th October 1846.

Recd 31 JB

379

Sir,

I have the honor with reference to my letter of the 15th Instant No. 429 to request the favor of your opinion on the subject of the tax proposed thereon to be fixed by me on the garden lands cultivated with Punjah, situated in the Villages of Manjenaickempatty and Chintalavadom patty attached to the Muttah of Veloor in the Talook of Iyempilly, to enable me to give the necessary orders for the realization of the Revenue thereon.

Dindigul
Sub Collectors
Cutcherry
30th October 1846
Recd 31 JB

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedt Servant

W. Nichol (?)

Sub Collector

From the Sub Coll

30th October

1840

No. 447.

381. 388

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 30th October 1840

Recd 1 Novr JB

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 30th of June last, the Tahsildar of Iyempilly reported on the 3 September that there was between the land occupied by Colla-pah Rock and [illegible] tank a distance of 13 yards in length and 1½ a yard in height and furnished an explanation of the matter by a plan as however it was not [illegible] in consequence [illegible] the mark nothing could be [illegible] with the letter and did yet [illegible] it was returned to the Tahsildar for a more correct account & on the 14 Instant a plan was forwarded showing the land, where [illegible] rock [illegible] taken, was under the tank instead of inside it & at a distance [illegible] it was observed that the Tahsildar had omitted to forward the first [illegible] for and arrived on the 23 Instant but without any explanation of the great difference observable in the two plans drawn up by the same person. The last one

-ne drawn up shews clearly that if
Kalitetty has any right whatever to enjoy
the land situated under his tank
... back, Ellapah Shaik has
in 1255 usurped land which already
belonged to another party - I agree that
... therefore to adhere to my former
decision of the 16 April last, as Kalitetty
immediately complained of the usur-
pation of his land to which Ellapah
Shaik does not appear to have stated
any higher reason than that the land
he had taken did not interfere
with that taken by Kalitetty whereas
it evidently forms a most material
part thereof.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient
[illegible]
S. Collector

[illegible]
Sub Collector
Cuckry [illegible]
30th October 1846

Recd 1 Nov. [illegible]

No 461

390

383

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 11th November 1846

Recd 12 Do

Sir,

1 I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th Instant No 876 on the Complaint of "in English and Tamil" of Rhyem Beg Sepoy 39th Regt. that an usual thoroughfare in the village of Cumbum in Thenkarey had been unjustly closed to his injury.

2. As nothing is known of this matter in this Cuchery the Petitions had been sent to the Talook and after investigation a report will be duly made to you on the subject.

3 The letter to your address from the officer Commanding the 39th Regt. is herein enclosed.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. Servant
[signature]
Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Collectors
Cucherry
11th November 1846
Recd 12 Do

Collr 11th Novr
1840

392 No. 467 7403

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 12th November 1840

Recd 13 Do

Sir

I have the honor to enclose an address received from the Tahsildar of Tonkarray dated 7th Instant informing me that a notice had been served on him from the Subordinate Court to defend in person or by Vakeel a suit instituted against him and others by one Arnanteah of Melmongalam respecting his fancied right to certain lands situated in the Village of Keelmongalam, granted to Salamiya by your orders of the 18th of July last, in consequence of the opinion expressed by myself in my letter to your address of the 15 of June previous No. 282.

2. It does not appear to me necessary for the Tahsildar to do aught in the matter, but allow the case as far as he is concerned to be tried exparty. There being no other defendant who is a (line) interested.

3. Should however you have any instructions for the Tahsildar I shall be happy to

to make the same known to him.

4. I may here mention that Ananteah declines receiving the money directed by your letter of the 30th Ultimo to be made over to him. There is [illegible] He wishes to let the same remain [illegible] until the decision is passed [illegible] to permit it.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servt
[illegible]
Sub Collector

Divisional
Sub Collector's
Cutchery
11th Novr 1846

Recd 13 [illegible]

From the Sub Coll[illegible]
12 Novr 1846

No. 470 394 387

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigull 13 November 18[illegible]

Recd. 14 JB

Sir,

I have the honor to bring to your notice that the only balance outstanding for Fusly 1255 in Iyem[illegible] is due from the [illegible] who cultivated land to the amount of Rupees 37" 8" 6 out of which he has paid 11" [illegible] leaving still due Rupees 26" 7" 3. The whole land was let out to 4 Persons but their crops are stated not to have been remunerative. As however the loss was not liable to deduction from the Settlement, according to the rules in force The Tahsildar appears to have sequestrated one of his horses to the amount of [illegible] 10 Rupees on the 20 of July last.

2. On my return to the Division I endeavoured to ascertain the means of the said Ryot; on a fit occasion he promised to pay the balance in 5 days; on the 12th of August I reminded the Tahsildar of the promise made before him as well as myself, he replied on the 16th August that the defaulter had tried to borrow the money but had failed.

3. It was ascertained from the Natamgar of the village that 4 other persons had cultivated the said land, and that 2 of them were security for the amount of rent

They

They denied this but a Witness deposed to its truth.

4. It appeared from the Statement of 2 of the Cultivators viz. Dasa Boyen, and Gudee Raютew that the defaulter had received from them in Money and grain to the value of about Rupees 34"4- but had only put off paid to the Circar Rupees 11"1"3.

5. The defaulter however deposed that he and his Uncle held jointly a house of 7 Ankanams 4 of which had been sequestrated for his balance to the Circar, whilst the whole house (7 Ankanams) has been since sequestrated by a Court Peon for a debt of his, to one Soobroya Chetty of that place in consequence of the value of certain 6 Guntahs of Nunjah land previously justified not having been considered sufficient. The said lands as well as the house have not yet been sold and I therefore request that the Court be informed the Circar has a demand, to the amount of 26"7"3- against the owner of the said property, and that the same be satisfied prior to any of the proceeds being appropriated to the liquidation of any debt due by the defaulter to Soobroy Chetty who has even himself allowed that the Circar Balance should first be satisfied therefrom

At

389 396

6. It also appears that in July 1845 13 Guntahs of Muttuvaran the defaulter's Nunjah land, was also purified by the Court in persuance of a decree given against him by the Moonsiff of Terruparamcoondam (No 343 of 1844) in favor of one Servana Permaul Pilly and sold in July last for 154 Rupees. Should this sum still remain in the Court the amount now due to the Circar should be immediately paid therefrom, for which purpose I beg to request a letter be addressed to the Subordinate Court.

7. The depositions &c. taken in the case are herewith forwarded.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
W. Elliot
Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Collector's
Cutchery
13th November 1846.
Recd 14 9B

To
The Principal Collector
of
Madura

From the Author
13th Novr 1846

No. 471.

398

391

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura.

Dindigul the 13th November 184[illegible]

Recd 14 JD

Sir,

1. I have the honor to enclose an arzy with documents on the petition (dated 9th Septr last) and claims of Vencatachellum Pilly, adopted son of Trevengadam Pilly to have his right to the Zemindary of 7 Villages in [illegible] in the Iyempilly Talook with all the information obtainable as required by your letter of the 10th Ultimo No. 791.

2. It appears from the arzy of the Tahsildar dated 10th Instant and the accompanying documents that the villages of [illegible]pilly Pettiambody, Caliampootoor, [illegible], Velampatty and Vo[illegible] were taken in auction by the father of the Petitioner but for what amount is not known. He possessed the same for 1 or 2 years when on default of payment of the Circar dues, the said Villages were aft[illegible]. Nothing further is to be gleaned from the records or the people but a year or two after the above said assumption Trevengadam pilly who also appears to have borne the name of Tirmalapalam goody Pilly, retired to Madura and died. One of the Mutahs allotted to Pettiambody is in the possession of the Zemindar of Ayacoddy. The Petitioner appears to have been two years old

when adopted, one year after which Treevingadam Pelly died.

3. There may exist particulars on the records of your office which cannot be found here and as the examination cannot be considered complete without reference to them, I am unable to prepare draft of an endorsement to meet the case.

Dindigul
Sub Collector's Cutchery
13th November 1846.

Recd 14 J.B.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient
[illegible]
Sub Collector

From the Sub Collector
13 Novr 1846

No. 472

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 13th November 18[illegible]

Recd 16th JS

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd Instant No. 865 and to enclose herein a copy of your order dated the 30th of July last to keep the village under sequestration after the balance due by the Nuttahdar had been cleared up.

2. On the 5th June the Jeufty Gomastah of Veloor sent the Takar Kyffyat for the villages of that Mootah but not being complete in certain particulars was returned on the 12 of July. It was received back on the 22 of the same month and being signed by you on the 27 was sent to the Tahsildar. On the 4 of August the Jeufty Gomastah sent another Kyffyat of new cases to this Cutchery which was sent to the Tahsildar on the 2nd September to draw up properly as the Ryots objected to the terms.

3. The Tahsildar sent the accompanying Kyffyat on the [illegible] of September to this Cutchery which was sent to the [illegible] Duftar but on [illegible] times, as the Ryots did not think it fair to be saddled with a heavier tax than they had been accustomed to without some previous

notice

notice, I submitted the subject for your Consideration and instruction and beg therefore to renew the recommendation Contained in the last Para of my letter to your address dated 15 Ultimo.

4 Petitions being received from two Ryots of Mangimalikenpatty stating that for many years no Baghayet had been cultivated in their lands they were forwarded to the Tahsildar who shewed that the statement of the Puffty Gomastah that the land had not been cultivated with garden produce for 2 years on which account the tax had been fixed at 10 fanams, was not correct for it had not been cultivated for 5 years on account of there not being sufficient water and no picotah whilst the ryot had no means of raising the water by any other method. On these grounds the tax on the said lands was reduced to 7 fanams the Guntah, which is the tax fixed on the surrounding Punjah lands. It was the wish to have all the lands so settled as for fusly 1255 merely the Punjah tax if so cultivated, which induced my application for your approval of the plan. I am not aware of there being any point connected with the settlement of the Ryots disputes which they could object to, with the

ex

395

exception of such lands, as are cultivated with Punjah, being indiscriminately and unjustly settled with garden tax.

5. A settlement of this point after the plan now proposed would doubtless be favourable to the Payment of all the Balances due on ... pattie - the [illegible] being of [illegible] village for Fusly 1255 was Rupees 4,925 „ 4 „ 11 - out of which Rupees 3,222 „ 14 „ 8 - have been paid and Rupees 1,[illegible]„ 3 „ [illegible] remain due.

6. [illegible] of the villages of the said Estate [illegible] to the Meettahdar according to [illegible] instructions of the 30th [illegible] - Copies of the orders issued with [illegible] accompany this communication -

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedt. Servt.

W. Eliot
Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Collector's
Cutchery
October 1846

Dispatched 14th
Recd 16th [illegible]

To
The Principal Collector
of Madura

From the [illegible]
13th November
1840

No. 474

404

397

From the Sub Collector.
To the Principal Collector of Madura.

Dindigul 13th November 1840.

Recd 16th JB

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 3rd Instant No. 803 and with reference to mine of the 6th Idem I beg to state that the answers of the Tahsildar of Nellacottah to my 2 Takeeds of the 6th Instant arrived on the 10th and that day in the former of which it is stated that out of Rupees 35 " 10 " 6 remaining after completion of the Channel west of the Codavanaar bridge at Porapatty Rupees 2 " 14 " 6 were due by one maistry who had not done the work for which he had taken advance but as he could not be found that amount could not be recovered but would be realized soon from his hire for work now being performed on Road No. 17 when the whole would be carried to account. In the letter observes that the work has been "completed at less than one third" but this on examination of the accounts the list of emergent works or even the figured statement in your letter under reply will be found not to be the case.

2. The Tahsildar states in his arzy of the 11th Instant that believing the channel would be the likely injured if the tasks mentioned in the Estimate were adhered to, had taken on himself to alter them. The

..ness of the ground whilst the width and depth were less than allowed for in the Estimate, had caused the difference in the outlay - The [illegible] ..ies of the Tahseldar are herein enclosed.

3 "The great dilatoriness in such works" has arisen chiefly from the imbecility and Sickness of the Tahseldars of the Talooks where such works were in progress - They are now both deceased, the head Talook officer of Nellacottah promised you on the 25 of July that the emergent Kirramut works should be finished in a week, but those in Nellacottah were not commenced for a month - He was then fined by me, but having been since promoted to the Principal Cutchery he is not responsible for any subsequent delay in such matters - Since you were pleased to commence finding fault with my returns I have fined that Tahseldar twice, and shall continue to do so on every repetition, as my returns are exact translations of those from the Talook which cannot be mistaken, duplicates thereof being submitted to your direct -

4 - It is observed in the 1st Para of your letter under reply that certain of my letters dated 30 October were dispatched on the following day - I am not aware of this being a particularly remarkable event, not more common in this than the Principal Cutchery but being so dispatched there does not appear any reason why they should not be received at the

same

same time with those put in the Tappal on the 31st viz on the 1st November (Sunday) when they are acknowledged to have been received. I do not understand the necessity for the entry but I trust it is not intended to be understood that none of my letters dated 30 of October were received by you on the following morning. I find none of my letters dated 30th and four dated 31st.

5. With reference to the Emergent Maramat return being dated 30th I beg respectfully to state it was rough and fair written on the 29th but in consequence of no Explanation being given by the Tahsildar of Todekombor regarding the road at Ulamaratahalty he was directed to be more explicit and his arzy arrived the following evening after the Tappal hour his remarks were then substituted for those in his former statement so that it could not by any possibility be dispatched on the 30th.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servt
[signature]
Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Collector's Cutchery
3rd November 1846.
Dispatched 14th

Dispatched 14th
Received 16th [initials]

From the [illegible]
13th Nov. 1846

No. 479

408

401

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 25 November 184[illegible]

Recd 26 [illegible]

Sir,

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th Ultimo No. 833 inclosing petitions from Conary Pillay and other 3 Natamgars of Combum and I respectfully beg to forward such documents as are to be found in this Cutchery.

2. The particular occasion to which the Petitions refer, [illegible] the removal of the Natamgars of Combum from their appointments may be well known to you [illegible] in consequence of proved fraud [illegible] about 4 years back. In [illegible] the present Petitioners were [illegible] by the Tahsildar Tenkarey but it having been discovered that those individuals were near relatives of the Natamgars recently dismissed by which the influence of the former may continued, other persons, not related, were directed, if fit, to be appointed to the vacancies on the 14th April 1843.

3. These Petitioners then addressed you on the subject of their claims but you were pleased to reject the same, by indorsement, dated 28 April 1845 confirming thereby the proceedings then established.

4. On the 17 and 18th of July 1845 Conary and others again addressed you to the effect

fect that out of the 5 New matamgars appointed
were [illegible] they, the Petitioners, were not
related to the [illegible] there and hoped
[illegible] the second.
[illegible] given them
that [illegible] is [illegible] incorrect they
[illegible] pass any
[illegible] In consequence
[illegible] the 2nd of Septem
[illegible] after ascertain
[illegible] the matter
[illegible] of Tenkarey
[illegible] the statement
[illegible] that the
[illegible] relationship
[illegible] had
[illegible] not appear
to be [illegible]

It [illegible] however that a
charge [illegible] brought against the
[illegible] Chinnama Rawten,
[illegible] Pilly and the
[illegible] Pilly, ~~with~~ Chinnama
Rawten left his village without leave during
the investigation, and at Conary Pilly in February
last [illegible] requested the appointment
[illegible] on the 23 of that month
to [illegible] the result of the examina-
tion should be known.

6 On the 1st of July Chinnama Rowten

requested in a petition to your address to have the appointment back given stating that in the petition against him was false he was accordingly reinstated on the 4th which order further states that the appointment of Conary Pilly was contrary to your instructions and that the five had been suspended neither of these had taken place as is fully shewn above - I was absent and could not therefore explain at the time but now beg to bring to your notice that a report has been received from the Tahsildar of Tangore by which it appears that frauds by the above said persons have been elicited - In consequence however of some further investigation remaining in consequence of the Nattamgars' influence ceasing the right to [illegible] receipts the case has to be sent back to the Tahsildar for completion - I would beg to recommend in the mean time that Conary Pilly be restored as he will form an assistance to Tahsildar whilst the Chinna Meera Rowten appears to be placing all the hindrance he can in the way of the Tahsildar's investigation -

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most Obed. Servt.

[signature]

Sub Collector

...igal
Collector's
...chry
...vember 1846
26th JM

[illegible] 412 / 605

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul [illegible] December 1846

Recd 2nd [illegible]

Sir

~~[illegible]~~ your letter of the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the honor

dated August — to enclose an [illegible] for [illegible] presented to

the Board [illegible] by [illegible] Lang[illegible]

Rowten and others [illegible] [illegible] hamlet

of Ohtoor in the [illegible] [illegible] claim

to certain lands [illegible] [illegible] had brought

into Cultivation ~~and~~ for which pottahs had been

granted them. The [illegible] is herein

enclosed.

Dindigul

Sub Collectors

Cucherry

1st December 1846

Recd 2nd [illegible]

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

[illegible]

Sub Collector

No 485

From the Sec[y]

1st Dec 1840

No. 493

414

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 4th December 1846
Recd 5th Do

407

Sir,

1 I have the honor to enclose a draft of a proposed indorsement for the vernacular version of a Petition dated 9th of July last presented to the Board of Revenue (No. 980/46) by certain Ryots of Ayacoodày against the exactions of the Zemindar of that place

2 I enclose Copies of 4 orders for the parties to come for the necessary examination, but as it will take time from their demur to appear with the requisite accounts a draft is now drawn up that the Case is under investigation, should it be required to give another on the Completion of the Case it can be given — The addresses to the Sub Collector & original English Petition accompany the communication

Dindigul
Sub Collectors
Cutcherry
4th December 1846
Recd 5th Do

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servant

W. Elliot
Sub Collector

From the Sabbath
14th Decr 17[illegible]

416

Draft of Proposed endorsement on Boards Petition No $\frac{720}{46}$ presented by Certain Ryots of Ayacoody

The Subjects Contained in this Petition are under investigation by the Sub Collector of Madura.

Dindigul
Sub Collectors
Cutcherry
4th December 1846

(Signed) Sub Collector

Recd 5 JB

No. 496

(2)

468

From the Sub Collector

To The Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 5th December 1846

Recd 9th " 13

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2 of October No 832 favouring me with copy of the Rev. Proceedings of the 24 September 1846 on the subject of a Petition from the Zemindar of Ammaianaickenoor requesting for certain reasons to be excused the interest levied on his balances for Fusly 1252 and 1253 and in accordance with the instructions therein contained beg to submit accounts which will point out the amount of balance dates of Sequestration, number of the villages dates of appointment list of Sibbendy and Sadervared expenses with discontinuance of the same and total amount of pay drawn also the amount realized each month from the villages under sequestration and an abstract of the whole of the above information

2 The Zemindar appears to have advanced as the main ground of his right to remission of interest, that the Sibbendy Establishment entertained had failed to realize the current revenue of the Estate during the time they remained in charge. Even if such were the case, the cause of objection or hindrance arose chiefly if not solely from the Zemindar's own proceedings. His demand of full tax on all land on which were withered crops the ryots would not agree to, because his promise to repair the tanks at his own expense, had never been performed whilst he never failed to demand the full rent although using his utmost endeavour to

stop

up the supply. The Zemindar was constant in his receipt from ryots of Collavettee or tank repairing levy, and equally so refusing to abide by the Conditions — The dispute respecting the Koolloo Inoferas of 20 Years standing. The Zemindar has not even hesitated to deny having given Cowls which bear his own Signature thus shewing a disposition to annoy and defraud the ryots as much as possible — He has also with held the Village accounts and had attempted no puttahs for the previous year. The Zemindar too had taken some portion of the rents from them in advance and when the ryots urged this as a reason for at least a corresponding reduction in the demand against them as had been promised, the Zemindar either denied the debt or would not consent, and the parties were obliged to sue for recovery. With all these and other hindrances and the fact of the actual cultivation not having been examined by any one, how was it possible in the absence of such accounts, no puttahs or muchelkas executed, & without settling the above disputes, to fix the true liabilities of the Ryots. The Villages were first joined in June 1852 — when there was no cultivation and scarcely any signs of it — The Zemindar did not know the Current demand and it could not therefore be made — and for 4 or 5 months there would be no Kist of the new fasly due. The Zemindar appears to quote the almost inextricable confusion into which he had contrived to throw his estate, as the chief ground for exemption from payment of interest and to support it would scarcely hesitate to add every species of Objection, which an annually selected Karbar might consider it convenient to advance or

invent

invent —

3 — Had the zemindary on the occasion of a bala[nce] occuring been fully sequestrated there is no doubt the realization would have been more speedy, but the confusio[n] by time would have become much greater — for the sum wou[ld] most probably have been borrowed from an expectant harbo[ur] on the usual terms of getting the former manager and mor[t]gage of some valuable portion of the Estate which system ha[s] with all my endeavours to avoid the evil consequences, at last shewn its fruit. The points of dispute however would have continued and even to this day the zemindar persists in withholding certain Village Accounts though repeatedly sent to for them. It appeared to me absolutely necessary that the Ryott disputes for Fusslee 1252 and 1253 should be settled that no place might be left for future misunderstanding. Such has been done and with respect to the balance due from the period of 1st sequestration to the present date, the cost of Collection Amount Collected by the Sircar & by the zemindar the following is an account in Rupees rejecting fractions —

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
[illegible]ly	Balance	Number of Villages	Collected by the Sircar	Deduct Sebbundy & Sader [illegible]ward	Remain[illegible]	Paid by the [illegible] Z-dar	Total of 6 & 7	Increase	Decrease
	Rs		Rs	Rs	Rs				
52	4191	3	4772	2[illegible]6	4516	—	4516	325	—
53	6519	16	4080	257	3823	2695	6518	—	—
[illegible]	1275	1	1354	79	1275	—	1275	—	—
[illegible]	1191	4	1301	20	1282	941	2221	1030	
[illegible]5	13470	6	5354	232	5122	4154	9276	—	4093
[illegible]al	7[illegible]6	—	16861	844	16018	7792	23808	1355	4093
									1355
						Net Balance			3337

The above shews that the cost of collection were only 5 per cent [on] the Sum Collected by the Seggestrating Servants –

4. The accompanying accounts will I believe afford every requisite information should it be otherwise I will do my best to supply the deficiency –

I have &c.

(Sigd) W Elliot
Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Collectors
Cutcherry
[2]d December 1840
Recd 9 [illegible]

True copy
J M [illegible]
[illegible]

From the Sub Collr
29 Decr 1840

Memo of particulars as furnished by the Duftur [illegible] Depart. in answer to the Board's proceedings of the 24th September 1846 regarding [illegible] Zemindary

The accompanying statement shews the arrears of Peshkush in 1252 and other subsequent fuslies up to 1255, sequestration of Villages, charges, collection, the amount collected by the sequestrating servants and the interest charged.

The Zemindar has hitherto collected [illegible] the [illegible] without any regular settlement [illegible] issuing Puttahs [illegible] from a long standing dispute between the Zemindar and the Ryots of [illegible] Village, the latter objected to the payment of tax of certain fuslies on the ground of non issue of Puttahs, some differences in the [illegible] non allowances of [illegible] and [illegible] up to the end of fusly 1252 the Zemindar had fallen into arrears to amount of [illegible] [illegible] sequestration of [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] balance [illegible] that Village. The then acting [illegible] Collector [illegible] [illegible] deputed the [illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] Aug. 1843

[illegible] of the Estate in pursuance whereof the

three Villages vizt Buttahutty Collelandon &

[illegible] were assumed, establishment entertained

& Collections made to amount of Rupees 4772 6 [illegible]

& what part of it was paid for the arrears of 1252

& 1253 & what part for the current Collection will be

seen by the Account above alluded to.

In the 3 Villages sequestrated there

was no arrears outstanding except the [illegible]

which could not be realized for reason of dispute

between the Zemindar and the Depositors the arrears

of Fusly 1253 of the 2 other Villages was duly levied

from the Ryots.

At the end of Fusly 1253 there was a balance

of Peshkush to amount of Rupees 47 5 6 and the whole

Zemindary was sequestered on the 9th Septr 18[illegible] establishment entertained Rupees 511 8 [illegible] of Fusly

1254 from which disbursed the Charges Collection

the statement of [illegible] will show what amount

was paid [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] the

[illegible]

[illegible] Regulations [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] known to the [illegible] as [illegible] to [illegible]

[illegible] which circumstances [illegible] the

Govt Pleadbook. [illegible] the Charges

[illegible] [illegible] 1825 [illegible]

[illegible] 1837 & 1825 [illegible]

[illegible] strict payment of Govt demand [illegible]

[illegible] of any information on the part of the [illegible]

[illegible] non payment of the [illegible] charges [illegible] the

Collector under instructions from [illegible] the

village of [illegible] as well as also [illegible] the

[illegible] [illegible]

The [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible] 212 [illegible] the end of [illegible]

1834 [illegible] villages [illegible]

on the 29th October 1843 Rs 270 [illegible] Collector [illegible]

[illegible] the charges [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

to pay the [illegible] the instalment [illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible] from which was disbursed the Charges Collections [illegible] remitted [illegible] to the [illegible] [illegible] in liquidation of the arrears of [illegible]

The arrears [illegible] charges [illegible] the [illegible] the 22nd [illegible] 1785 during which the estates was under the management of the Zemindar [illegible] respectively Total Rs 1275 [illegible]

[illegible] the 22 March 1785 the date on which [illegible] was established there were balances of Rs [illegible] including interest of Rs 4604 [illegible] up to the [illegible] of July 1785.

The accompanying letter from the Collector in answer to the Board's Proceedings [illegible] shows the [illegible] of the Zemindar [illegible] other particulars connected with his Zemindary. The said Collector states the balance [illegible] at Rs 3037 instead of Rs 4695 [illegible] he was called upon to explain the difference on the [illegible]

10 From the [illegible] a part of the Zemindary of [illegible] at times the whole of it has been under [illegible] the cause of [illegible] the Circumstances of the Board's [illegible] as [illegible] by Regulation [illegible] of 1802 is [illegible]

[illegible] from the [illegible] Collector [illegible]

426 when a part of the Zemindarees sequestered for the

until payable for the sequestrating Servants &c

~~[illegible]~~ deputed on any lands after inspection

of the Sebbundy Charges, & the [illegible] increase to the

Zemindary being in sequestration 149

The above said Villages are then under attachment for arrears of Peishcush of July 1835 to amount of Rs 4693 4. 6 up to November of the Current year —

Observations of the Zemindar that the balance against the Ryots of some Villages had not been levied, that the charge of interest on the whole balance was unjust, & that the sequestrating Servants had not realized the balances for which part of the Zemindary was sequestrated [illegible] grounds from particulars [illegible] the accompanying Statement.

Why no interest was charged on the balances for July 1834 will be seen [illegible]

No. 447 428

427

From the Sub Collector
To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 10th December 1840

Recd 11th

Sir,

I have the honor to forward the re-
port of the Tahsildar of Vedaseroy dated
4th Instant on the Subject of the Water dis-
pute between Meera Rowther and Rama
soobien of Thamaracollam. [illegible] in-
habitant Veeraragavachairin of 80 years old
deposed that in Mr. Hurdis's time the
persons belonging to the father of Rama
soobeah, with those belonging to one Yerra-
mal and those of the party (Cooppa Kelly)
who sold the land to Meera Rowther, all
assisted in digging a well and that the lands
of the Ramasoobeah and Yerramal were fully
irrigated, but only 1/4 of a Goontah of that
held by Cooppah Kelly received a Supply –
Three years back the sides of the Well gave
way – and one Ramasawmy who had taken
the lands of Ramasoobeah and Yerramaul
on lease, dug a new well near the old one
and irrigated his land – Besides which
the 1/4 Goontah of Meera Rowther with other
[illegible] to him also received a share –

that he heard that the said Meera Rawtin had paid a third share of the expenses.

2. Two Witnesses, 40 years old, support ed the above evidence as far back as their memory could taken them –

3. Three other old inhabitants deposed to the Custom of irrigation but knew no particulars of Cost &c. –

Dindigul
Sub Collector's
Cutchery
16th December 1846

Recd 11th J.B.

I have the honor to
Sir
Your most obedt Servt

[illegible]
Sub Collector

1840

No. 498

430

423

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 10th December 1846

Recd 11 Dr

Sir,

I have the honor to inclose with reference to your letter of the 9th ultimo No. 876 the report of the Tahsildar on the Petition of Rhyem Beg Sepoy 39 Regt. N. I. respecting the closing up of a thorough fare in the village of Cumbum in Tenkarry, by which it appears the party have made up between them the point of Dispute by removal of the hedge which stopped up the usual path the ground of Petitioners complaint.

Dindigul
Sub Collectors
Cucherry
10th December 1846

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. Servant

Recd 11 Dr

[illegible]
Sub Collector

No 498.

From the Sub
10th Decr 1840

No. 301 1 432 426 a

From the Sub Collector

To the Principal Collector of Madura

Dindigul 11th December 1840

Recd 12 D

Sir

With reference to your letter of the 2d Inst I have the honor to enclose herein the particulars of the holdings of certain Ryots of Siddiencottah cultivating lands in the village Akhoor - In the Puttodah time the Tahsildar of Tadikomboo entered all the lands which the Bramins wished to take and 42 13/16 Goontah of what they left were subsequently taken up by the Ryots of Siddiencottah who spent 295 Rupees in preparing the same for Nunjah Cultivation and enjoyed the same for 3 Years - They have now cultivated part or the whole of the same but the entry is made in the cultivation account in the name of the Bramins, in conformity with your instructions of the 3d of July last -

2. With reference to the merits of the case I do not feel at liberty to offer any opinion, as it was to annul my proceedings in the matter of giving lands left waste to the said individuals

that the order above quoted was issued, and have been carried out - but in consequence of the Siddeemcottah Ryot having held the same for three years and been to so great expense for turning waste lands into valuable cultivation, which could scarcely fail to excite the cupidity of the Bramins of that village, I consider their case particularly deserving of your kind consideration -

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedt. Servt.

W. White
Sub Collector

Dindigul
Sub Collector's
Cutchery
4th December 1846.

Recd 12 D

From the Sub Collr 4 Dec 1846

434

ஸ்ரீ

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

னையாறெதரல் அது அவனாறுபதிய யாது மெனுறுகாணிலே
வதாரே அயமெரபய இவ்வகொ துருகா சாதுய தையொ
வதியெதேரெ அவாறுவசமயாகுமேல்லை.

இப்படிக்கு மிதகவலாறு,
அபலதுனை லெருகாரசயறு.

[illegible] துரை அவர்களு(க்கு)
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
வெள்ளி [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

(4) [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Statement of Cultivation of the Meera Hoosaen

Names	No. of Stollams	Names of Stollam	Teerwah for each Cooly				Cultivation of 53 Fusly				
			Hoollool		Moonasid		Land		Tax		
			Ch.	F	Ch	F	Go	A	Ch	F	A
Perria Koroonad Neerah Cabah	1304	Arasiddy	1	1	1	2	3	3	3	8	4
	1355	Do.	1	1	1	2	5	10	6	7	8
	1357	Neenjah	1	1	1	2	-	14½	1	-	14
	1363	Do.	1	1	1	2	1	9	1	8	12
	795	Battavartty	1	8	1	5	1	7¾	2	2	4½
	810	Karnapoolly	1	8	1	5	2	1	3	-	15
	710	Veeroosiddy	1	8	1	5	1	3	1	7	13
	807	Allam Kolam	1	4	1	4	1	½	1	4	7
	812	Do.	1	8	1	5	2	15	4	1	1
		Total Neenjah					19	15¾	28	4	14
	1340	Arasiddy Neenjahmal Peenjah					4	10	2	7	12
		Grand Total					24	9⅓	29	2	10
Meera Hoosaen Cabah	615	Manel Kany	3	6	2	2	-	7½	1	-	-
	710	Veeroosiddy	1	8	1	5	2	3	3	2	14
	789	Battavartty	1	8	1	5	1	7¾	2	2	4½
	712	Veeroosiddy	1	8	1	5	1	3	1	1	10
	711	Do.	1	4	1	4	2	2¼	2	1	13
	814	Allan Kolam	1	8	1	5	1	7¼	2	1	4½
	1312	Oodamba Maram	1	1	1	2	2	4¼	2	7	3
	1307	Karcapoolly	1	1	1	2	4	3¾	5	-	13
	1351	Nanjah	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	8
	1306	Karcapoolly	1	-	-	8	-	-	-		
	1359	Arasiddy	1	1	1	2	1	10¼	1	9	11
	1305	Do.	1	-	-	8	-	-			
		Total					18	9	24	0	4
		Grand Total					42	2¾	53	8	14

…lebah &c in the Village of Aettoor of the
Todekombor Talook

Cultivation of 54 Fusly					Cultivation of 55 Fusly					Remark
Land		Fay			Land		Fay			
Gs	N	Ch	F	N	Gs	N	Ch	F	N	
3	3	3	8	4	3	3	3	8	4	
[illegible]	10	6	7	8	5	10	6	7	8	
[illegible]	14 1/2	1	-	14	-	14 2/1	1	-	14	
[illegible]	15 4/3	2	3	13	1	7 4/3	2	3	15	
[illegible]	7 4/3	2	2	4 4/1	-	15 4/1	1	4	4 3/3	
[illegible]	[illegible]	3	-	15	1	7 4/1	2	1	12	
[illegible]	3	1	7	13	1	3	1	7	3	
[illegible]	1/2	1	4	7	1	2/1	1	4	7	
[illegible]	15	4	4	1	2	15	4	4	1	
2	5 2/1	26	9	15 4/1	19	4 4/1	25	2	13 4/1	
4	10	3	2	6	1	8	1	8	-	
[illegible]	4/1	30	2	6 4/1	20	12 4/1	27	-	13 2/1	
[illegible]	7 2/1	1	-	5	-	7 2/1	1	-	5	
[illegible]	3	3	2	13	2	3	3	2	13	
[illegible]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	7	13	1	3	1	7	13	
[illegible]	2 4/[illegible]	2	9	15 2/1	2	2 4/1	2	9	15	
[illegible]	7 4/[illegible]	2	1	12 4/9	1	7 4/4	2	1	12	
[illegible]	4 4/1	2	7	3	2	4 4/4	2	7	3	
[illegible]	1 4/3	[illegible]	5	5	2	1 2/0	2	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	2	1	3	8	1	2	1	9	8	
[illegible]	2	1	7	-	2	2	2	5	8	
[illegible]	10 4/4	1	9	11	1	10 4/1	1	9	11	
[illegible]	7 4/4	1	1	14	1	7 4/3	1	7	13	
[illegible]	3	22	7	4 4/1	18	3	24	1	11 4/1	
[illegible]	3 2/1	52	9	10 2/1	38	15 4/4	51	2	8 4/3	

Remark.

These Ryots are said to have Cultivated certain of these lands during the present (1250)th Fusly according to the Principal Collector's orders of the 3rd July 1840 the same are entered in the name of the Bramins —

[illegible]
Prl Collector

Proposed Indorsement on Board's Petition No. $\frac{1143}{46}$ from Mahomed Meerahkably Rowten and others dated 9th August 1846. (43) 1

Should Petitioners feel themselves aggrieved by the order to the Talook dated 3rd July 1846 to the effect that certain lands for which they had puttahs should be given over to the Bramins of Akloof who considered themselves Hurdars of that village they can move the Civil Side of the Zillah Adalut.

W. Elliott
Sub Collector